ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

O F57l
Fitzgerald v.2
ectures on 1867443
cclesiastical history
STORAGE

M.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

STO

STO

NTY PUBLIC LIBRARY

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-192_2

4484

1567443

LECTURES
ON
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

INCLUDING THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE
ENGLISH REFORMATION FROM WICKLIFFE
TO THE GREAT REBELLION

DELIVERED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN

BY

WILLIAM FITZGERALD, D.D.

LATE BISHOP OF KILLALOE AND CLONFERT

EDITED BY THE

REV. WILLIAM FITZGERALD, A.M. AND JOHN QUARRY, D.D.

WITH MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR'S LIFE AND WRITINGS

V. 2

IN TWO VOLUMES—VOL. II.

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET
1885

All rights reserved

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF
FT. WAYNE & ALLEN CO.

1867443

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

VOL. II.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

THIRD COURSE (*continued*).

LECTURE PAGE

III. Ambition of Early Roman Bishops—Victor and Stephen—Rise of Metropolitan Jurisdiction . . 3

IV. Advantages enjoyed by the Roman Bishops—Resort of Athanasius and Chrysostom to Rome—Council of Sardica 16

V. Difficulties of Universal Empire—No Central Authority for three hundred Years in the Idea of Church Unity—Forged Decretals 28

VI. Causes that made the Reception of the Decretals possible—Gregory VII. 41

VII. Gregory VII.—Question of Investiture — Clerical Celibacy 54

VIII. Retrospect of the Rise and Growth of the Papacy . 67

IX. On the use of Fanaticism in the Church of Rome—Conflicts between the Secular and the Regular Clergy 76

X. Comparison of the Dominicans and Franciscans . . 92

XI. Comparison between Eastern and Western Monasticism—Elements of Danger to the Papacy in the latter 98

XII. The Schoolmen—Theology as a Science 106

XIII. Sæculum Synodale—Condemnation of Huss . . . 113

FOURTH COURSE.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

LECTURE PAGE
I. The English Reformation—Its Origin, and Causes of the subsequent Check to its Progress 127
II. Wickliffe 143
III. Predisposing Causes of the Reformation in England . 160
IV. Influence of the Revival of Letters—Erasmus . . 176
V. The Real Basis of the English Reformation . . . 194
VI. Influence of German Protestantism on the English Reformation 206
VII. Influence of Geneva on the English Reformation . 222
VIII. The Royal Supremacy from Henry VIII. to the Restoration 235
IX. Reaction under Charles I. and Laud, and Laudian Theology 247
X. Laudian Theology (*continued*) 258

APPENDIX.

I. Remarks on the Epistle of St. Barnabas . . . 272
II. Peter Oliva 281
III. William de St. Amour, and Richard of Armagh . . 286
IV. Wickliffe 289
V. John Huss 292
VI. Rosinus and Spalatinus on Erasmus 295
VII. Overtures of the Lutherans to the Greek Church . 297

INDEX 301

THIRD COURSE—*continued*

Rise and Progress of the Papacy

WITH

REMARKS ON THE MONASTIC ORDERS

LECTURE III.

AMBITION OF EARLY ROMAN BISHOPS—VICTOR AND STEPHEN—RISE OF METROPOLITAN JURISDICTION.

GENTLEMEN,—I alluded, at the close of my last lecture, to the ambitious spirit which at a very early period began to characterise the Roman Prelates. That spirit was the natural temper of the race, finding a new development for itself in the circumstances of the Christian Church.

Infidel writers have been fond of reckoning Christianity among the causes of the downfall of the old Roman Empire. I do not think that such an imputation is just, though perhaps it would not be very scandalous to our religion if it were. But in truth, the Roman Empire was irrecoverably doomed to destruction long before Christianity arose, and whether Christianity had arisen or not, Rome must have perished under the action of the same influences as did in fact work her ruin. Christianity was so far from destroying what was great and manly in the old Roman character, that, on the contrary, it revived that character and opened a fresh field for the exercise of its energies.

The resolute iron spirit of the old Romans had melted away in the state under a general relaxation of morals. The severe discipline of private families which had formed the stern and continent statesmen and soldiers of the Republic was gone. The very idea of the Republic itself, as the object of any strong patriotic feeling, as a thing to be warmly loved and nobly struggled for, had faded from men's minds, or was remembered only as a schoolboy's theme. It was not the respect and veneration of their fellow-citizens, and a

moral influence over the mind of their countrymen, that leading persons any longer coveted. It was the favour of a despotic prince, or of his baser minions; it was this, as the means of acquiring wealth and power to be used as mere instruments of luxury and self-indulgence, which was the prize that public men proposed as the aim of their political career. Nor was there in the whole political world of the Roman Empire a single element of salvation to remedy such a state of things, and restore the temper of the Camilluses and the Scipios. So completely, indeed, had all traces of that old Roman character disappeared from Rome, that one might have supposed it not only hidden but extinguished, if it were not that the circumstances of the Christian Church rekindled it in a fresher atmosphere, and fanned it into a still more brilliant blaze. Christianity restored effectually, what nothing else could, that severe discipline and self-command which is the foundation of private virtue and the guarantee of public. It substituted in the Church a newer and still more stirring object of generous self-devotion than the worn-out image of the Republic, and it gave that image, what the state had lost, the consecration of fresh and active religious feelings. The sacred associations connected with the city of Rome were the feeble relics of an outworn mythology; Romulus and Remus, and Jupiter of the Capitol, and the Sibylline Books, and the eternal fire of Vesta, belonged to a bygone age, and their power was scarcely able to excite one throb of emotion in any Roman bosom. But the sacred associations connected with the Church of Rome were living and active, and came upon men's minds with a vivid sense of reality, bringing the supernatural with a startling effect once more into the dull sphere of ordinary life. Romulus and Remus were the fading phantoms of a dissolving dream. Peter and Paul were the heroes of a recent work, which had impressed a new impulse upon the world. And while these high thoughts combined to give strength and power to the revived character of Christian Romans, the constitution of the Church served still more to confirm that

strength and energise that power of character. It was, like the old Roman, an aristocracy mixed with popular institutions. It was by winning the favour of the body of the faithful that eminence among them was to be gained; and that eminence itself was a moral pre-eminence, to be exercised in influencing and guiding the general opinion of the mass.

It was, then, under such circumstances as these that, as I said, the old Roman genius revived in the Church, and shaped for itself eventually a new Empire, even still more wonderful than the old. 'That the old Romans, by their valour, their public virtue, and their immense superiority in the art of war, should have raised an empire over the surrounding nations, who were all, except the Greeks, their inferiors in everything but animal courage and brute force, is not so very astonishing as to a careless eye it may at first appear. But that after their extraordinary success had enriched them with the spoils of all nations: after their riches had introduced luxury, effeminacy, and indolence: after they had, by their vices, become in their turn a prey to the barbarians they had formerly subdued: after the Empire came to be torn to pieces by Goths, Vandals, Huns, and Lombards: when the sun of science was now set, and the night of ignorance, superstition, and barbarism was fast advancing: that out of the ruins of everything great and venerable there should spring a new species of despotism never heard of or imagined before, whose means of conquest and defence were neither swords nor spears, fortifications nor warlike engines, but definitions and canons, sophisms and anathemas; and that by such kind of weapons, as by a kind of magic, there should actually be reared a second universal monarchy, the most formidable the world ever knew, will to latest ages afford matter of astonishment to every reflecting mind.'

There are some, however, who while they are ready to admit and even to exaggerate perhaps the ambitious tendencies of the later line of Popes, yet shrink, as if it implied something profane if not blasphemous, from imputing anything so

coarse and worldly as love of power and desire of preeminence to the martyr Bishops of the early Church. Such feelings as these have their origin, I suspect, partly in an ignorance of human nature and partly in an ignorance of history; they spring partly from a wrong and under-estimate of the subtlety of the spirit of ambition, and partly from an over-estimate of the purity of the times in question.

If by ambition be meant a ruling desire, consciously indulged, of personal aggrandisement for its own sake, then such a feeling is no doubt remote from the character of a person under any strong sense of Christian religion. But I need hardly tell you that this consciously indulged ambition is not its only, nor perhaps even its commonest form, at least in cases where it operates most successfully. In such a shape it could hardly exercise any strong influence over a religious mind, while a thoroughly irreligious mind could scarcely act its part so well as to exercise any strong influence over others. The demon of ambition must transform itself into an angel of light, before it can captivate the minds which most powerfully affect such a body as the Christian Church. It must clothe itself with specious appearances of zeal for the truth, for the honour of God, for the cause of righteousness, for the good of the Church; it must operate first in the way of a prejudice disposing the mind to receive and act upon such persuasions as tend to justify it in strengthening and increasing its own power and influence; it is thus indirectly or in disguise that ambition will operate in the souls of those, who being themselves to a great extent enthusiasts, are best fitted to work up and work upon the enthusiasm of others.

Be on your guard then, in studying Ecclesiastical, and indeed in studying any history, against two opposite errors connected with this subject: (1) That of suspecting entirely the piety and self-devotion and private virtues of those whose conduct manifestly proves them to have been under the influence of a strong predominating ambition. Do not, I say, infer from this latter circumstance, that their piety and other virtues must have been, in the coarsest sense of the word, mere

hypocrisy, a mere mask assumed for the purpose of blinding others to their real character and aims. (2) Nor yet on the other hand suffer yourselves to be persuaded that because such men were to a great extent really pious, and ready to sacrifice self, that is, any other self but the citadel of self where ambition had its throne; because they were ready, for example, to lay down their lives for the sake of God and the Church; therefore they could not be under the influence of ambition, and all that seems ambitious in their conduct must have sprung from a pure and single-minded regard to the discharge of what they believed to be their duty. The confusion which lies at the bottom of both these mistakes is hidden in the ambiguous word 'sincerity.' In one sense a man is sincere when he really believes himself to be acting from the motives and principles which he puts forward to the world. This is being sincere in the sense of not designedly imposing upon others. But, in another sense, he only can be called sincere who is not imposing on himself, who is not masking over to his own mind the secret impulse under which he acts by covering it with specious colouring and pretences of virtue.

We have a notable instance of such confusions as these in the way in which the character of Oliver Cromwell has been dealt with. Some, from the manifest evidence of his public conduct, have pronounced him one of the most ambitious characters that history can produce, and thence have gone on to stigmatise his devotion, his temperance, and his other many apparent virtues, as mere coarse hypocrisy and pretence. Others again, finding him to have been in his most private moments, and in the seclusion of his family, the same apparently devout and even pious man that he appeared in public, have inferred that he could not have been ambitious at all, and that he really murdered his sovereign, expelled the House of Commons from whom he held his own commission, and made himself master of all the liberties of England, out of a pure and single-minded regard to the honour of the gospel and the good of his country!

The true inference would only be that he believed himself

to be acting from such motives. But what was the concealed power which captivated his understanding, and led him to believe that such a course of conduct could be the result of such principles—what blinded his eyes in this to absurdities which he would have clearly seen in any other? These are the true questions to be answered in estimating such a character; and they are questions which we cannot answer satisfactorily till we recognise the fact that ambition masters some of the highest minds, not in its own undisguised shape, immediately commanding the will, but by gaining sway first over the understanding, and persuading it that the course which gratifies our love of power is the course indicated by the sternest duty.

I do not apply this theory to the conduct merely of the earlier Bishops of Rome. I believe that it is equally, perhaps in some instances still more, applicable to several of the later ones. I apply it as freely to Gregory VII. as to Gregory I. I give Leo XII. the benefit of it quite as readily as Leo the Great.

One of the earliest instances of this tendency to domineer, which I have remarked as having so soon betrayed itself in the Roman prelates, is to be found in the case of Victor and the Bishops of Asia Minor. It was a case in which Rome endeavoured at a very early period to make itself the model Church, not only of the West, but of all the world. Victor was persuaded that, in his way of keeping Easter, he faithfully retained the traditionary custom handed down from his great predecessors, Peter and Paul. He stood at the head, as it were, of a strong party in the Church, actuated by that powerful anti-Judaic feeling which was the sharp reaction from the Judaising tendencies of the first century. And, taking advantage of this position, he ventured upon the bold step of threatening to cut off—some say of actually cutting off—the dissenting Bishops of Asia Minor from the communion of the faithful.

It is remarkable that one of the most decisive voices raised against this overbearing and intolerant proceeding was from

that very Irenæus whom Romanists represent as laying down the principle, that the authority of the Roman Church is supreme, and that all the faithful are bound to conform to its decisions; and the very ground of Irenæus' protest is the right of independent Churches to judge and act for themselves in all such matters.[1]

Another instance of the same overbearing temper may be given in Pope Stephen's attempt to force the custom of the Roman Church, in recognising the validity of heretical baptism, upon Cyprian of Carthage. It is curious that, in this instance also, we have one of the writers to whom Romanists refer as most strongly asserting the Papal claims, giving a practical exposition of his own meaning quite different from what might be expected if their representation of it be correct. Cyprian is never for a moment shaken by the authority of the successor of Peter—the occupier of that principal chair from which episcopal unity took its rise. From the traditionary customs of Rome he appeals boldly to Scripture and reason as paramount authorities. He assembles his neighbouring brother-Bishops. He writes to, he seeks and receives the support of, more distant prelates. One of their replies—the letter of Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia—he seems to have himself translated into Latin, and published in that form for the benefit of the Western world. The tone and spirit of that letter was certainly not encouraging to Pope Stephen. Firmilian begins by comforting himself with the thought that, as the treason of Judas brought about the salvation of the world, so the insolence and audacity (such are his very words) of Stephen had given him the advantage of making such a valuable acquaintance as Cyprian. Passing on to Stephen's plea, that the recognition of the baptism of heretics was a tradition handed down from the Apostles, he bluntly observes that no one could be so foolish as to believe that. 'Neminem tam stultum esse qui hoc credat Apostolos tradidisse.' He declares that it is a slander upon the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, to assert such a thing.

---

[1] Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24.

And turning the tables completely upon the Church of Rome, he attacks them for varying in some respects from the traditionary practices of Jerusalem in the Easter solemnities, and thereby showing that they did not adhere as strictly as they pretended to the tradition of the Apostles. He declares that Stephen is the most inconsistent of all men in acknowledging the baptism of heretics, since he claims to be the successor of that very Peter who was made the type of the exclusive oneness of the Church, whereas Stephen, he says, is recognising heretical bodies as possessing the power which belongs only to the Church, and thus making many Rocks instead of one. And finally, turning his discourse by a rhetorical figure to Stephen himself, he says that he is worse than all heretics, and that by his uncharitable censures he had cut off not the other Bishops but himself from the communion of the Catholic Church.

The conduct of Stephen seems indeed to have been arrogant in the extreme. He had refused even to see the African Bishops who came to remonstrate with him, and had required all the faithful to exclude them from their houses, and refuse them not only peace and communion, but even the common attentions of hospitality. In meeting this intolerable suggestion, Cyprian, though perfectly firm, is yet throughout perfectly respectful—as one who belonged to a province the Christians of which had been long accustomed to look up with peculiar reverence to the example of the Roman See. But Firmilian breaks often into a tone of even contemptuous bitterness, and almost always writes in one of such indignant astonishment as to show plainly that he considered the arrogant assumption of the Bishop of Rome a thing at once strange and unreasonable.[2]

However, in both these proceedings—that of Victor and that of Stephen—audacious and arrogant as they were, there was nothing involved of a claim to legislate for the whole Church. The Bishop of Rome did not come forward ostensibly to make laws, but to bear testimony to the rule which he

---

[2] Cypriani *Epistolæ*, lxvi.–lxxv. Firmilian's Epistle is numbered lxxiv.

alleged himself to have received from the Apostolic founders of his Church. It was Peter and Paul that were the lawgivers, Victor and Stephen were only the keepers and witnesses of their decrees. These proceedings did not in themselves necessarily imply any claim to superior jurisdiction or official supremacy on the part of the Bishop of Rome. They only implied that Peter and Paul had the power of binding the whole Church, and that he, as their successor, was cognisant of their tradition, and bound to bear witness to it in the face of the world. To be sure, if the Bishop of Rome were to judge of such facts without appeal, and if all the rest of the Church were bound to abide by his decision, this would come to the same thing in substance as the highest claim of legislative power; but it is not at all the same thing in form. Nor does it appear that either of those Prelates assumed to judge without appeal. They assumed that all, or the majority, of the Apostolic Churches would agree with their tradition; and on that assumption they seem to have proceeded to declare their opponents cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church. But it is equally clear that in both cases there was an appeal from their decision—an appeal to the general sense of the various episcopates which composed that Catholic Church; and that the fulminations of the Roman Prelates were mere empty noise when not supported by the general feeling of the Church.

In short, in these bold excommunications it appears to me that the Popes came forward as organs of the public opinion of the Universal Church, and expecting to be supported by it, not as distinctly claiming any right to command the obedience of other Bishops. These two notions you will observe are perfectly distinct, though they will in practice readily pass into one another. The arrogance of a man who speaks in the name of others whom he has not taken the trouble to consult, on the assumption that his view of the matter is so certainly right that they will infallibly agree with him, is quite different from the arrogance of the man who speaks for

others under the notion that he has a right to compromise and bind them, whether they agree with him or not.

In fact, if we scan narrowly the principles of the third century with respect to Church unity, as they are put forward by Cyprian and Firmilian, it will appear that every excommunication was, in a manner, anticipatory of the judgment of the Universal Church, and contained in it a tacit appeal to that judgment. The episcopate according to those principles is one and indivisible. He therefore that is lawfully separated from the communion of any one Bishop is separated from the communion of all. The theory, to be worked out properly, would require that all Bishops actually thought and judged alike, and that all and each judged aright in every case. But this not being the case in fact, it seemed necessarily to follow, either that any one Bishop was to be justified in compromising all his brethren by his decisions whether right or wrong; or that no single Bishop should ever act without the advice of all his brethren; or that his sentences should be understood as to a certain extent tentative, holding provisionally good, but leaving his brethren a right of reconsidering them and acting accordingly.

The first of these was too monstrous to be entertained for a moment as a possible supposition. The second was to a certain extent practically carried out by the regular assembly of Provincial Councils in Greece and North Africa; but then, after all, these were but provincial, and therefore could not certainly speak the sense of the whole Church. It remained therefore, that in cases of less importance each Bishop should act summarily for himself; but that in matters of greater moment, the general expression of the feelings of the episcopate by way of letters and mutual explanations should be waited for before any decisive step was taken. The great rashness of Victor seemed to be that, in a matter in which the Church had been long divided, without ascertaining that the sense of his colleagues was with him in the matter, he had presumed to separate whole dioceses of Asia Minor from the communion of the Catholic Church. The arrogancy of

Stephen was of a similar kind. He had assumed that his view of the tradition of the Apostles was that in which all other prelates ought to agree, and so had declared Cyprian and his brethren separated from the communion of the Church.

In fact, it would seem that, in order fully to carry out the Cyprianic theory, there lay in every case an appeal from every one Bishop to every other, and that such appeals were only limited by accidental circumstances, such as the intolerable inconvenience of discussing matters of fact at a distance from the spot where they occurred. Every Bishop was, indeed, on this theory absolutely irresponsible in one sense, so far as his own flock were concerned; but as his acts concerned the whole Church, they were liable to be considered and judged of by every one of his brethren. There was a kind of tacit understanding at the bottom of the theory, that the Church was the main body of the Episcopate; and parties therefore aggrieved by one Bishop had recourse to another, and sought his communion, the granting of which they hoped might clear their character in the eyes of the rest of the Churches. Now this was in its nature a constitution of things verging towards anarchy; and the inconveniences of it seem to have led to the regular metropolitical jurisdiction, in which the appeal was made to a fixed See, and was made to that as to a superior jurisdiction.

The origin of the metropolitical jurisdiction has been accounted for in various ways by writers on ecclesiastical antiquities. By some it has been considered as one out of many instances in which the Church accommodated itself to pagan customs. But what has been alleged in behalf of this notion is a curious instance of critical perversity. For, as far as I can see, the whole evidence of a regular jurisdiction exercised by a chief priest among the pagans over the priests of a whole province is derived from Julian the Apostate; who we know endeavoured to remodel the pagan hierarchy upon the plan of the Christian.

Others again have referred this institution entirely to Constantine, and supposed it to be framed in accordance with

the civil constitution of the provincial government. To me it seems probable that this, like many other similar institutions, had no one author, but grew up gradually from the force of circumstances, without any model being consciously before the minds of those whose practice insensibly framed it.

According to strict theory, as I said, every Church had an interest in the proceedings of every other Church. But in point of fact, the connection of one Church with another would be more or less intimate according to circumstances. Aggrieved parties, for example, having for their object the clearing of their characters in the eyes of the whole Church, would naturally appeal to the Churches of greatest influence and notoriety; and as of course, out of the whole community, they would choose specially to be restored to the good opinion of their neighbours, they would, if they thought they had a chance of success, appeal to the Church of greatest influence and notoriety in that neighbourhood. Now as the influence and notoriety of the Church would depend greatly upon the size and position of the city in which it was situated, we see readily that recourse would naturally be made from the smaller to the greater Churches—from the province to the capital. At times, however, and until law had given the Church a fixed constitution, the personal eminence of a particular prelate would determine the appeal to him, rather than to a Church which from its size and affluence would, under ordinary circumstances, have been preferred. Of this we have an instance in the case of the Spanish Bishops, who actually appealed from Rome to Carthage, in a case in which Stephen had directed submission to Basilides and Martialis, instead of Felix and Sabinus.[3] Now here there is a plain case that no one could have supposed that Carthage had any jurisdiction, properly so-called, over Rome; and the appeal must therefore have been made in reality, as I said before, to public opinion. It was the weight—the authority in that sense—of the sentence that was sought; and therefore the sentence sought was

---

[3] Cypriani *Epist.* lxvii.

the one most likely to carry with it the sense of the whole Church. Stephen's character at that time was so completely damaged, and Cyprian's raised so high, that the judgment of a Carthaginian synod outweighed that of the Apostolic See. In the long run, however, the permanent advantages of such a position as a capital city gave to its Bishops would prevail against temporary and occasional disturbances of such influence; and gradually it would come to be a fixed rule that, though upon an emergency any Bishop might interpose his offices for the benefit of the Church, yet in all ordinary cases the metropolitan should be considered as the proper person to interfere.

The metropolitical jurisdiction then, I imagine, grew up under the influence of circumstances, from the necessity of the case, limiting to, and devolving upon, some one prelate in particular that duty of attending to, and interfering in, the disputes and grievances of surrounding Churches, which in theory belonged to each and every member of the Episcopal College. And accordingly you will observe that it bears all the marks of an arrangement of this nature. The metropolitical authority is not necessarily connected with the dignity of the Apostolic Sees, but depends upon the civil eminence of the town, and changes from place to place as that varies. Thus, Jerusalem is dependent on Cæsarea; and Alexandria ranks before Antioch, as being a more considerable city, though not directly founded (like Antioch) by an Apostle, but only by an Evangelist.

LECTURE IV.

ADVANTAGES ENJOYED BY THE ROMAN BISHOPS—RESORT OF ATHANASIUS AND CHRYSOSTOM TO ROME—COUNCIL OF SARDICA.

Gentlemen,—In my last lecture I endeavoured to point out to you that, according to the theory generally recognised in the third century, a certain interest in the affairs of each and every other Church was vested in each and every Bishop. This was the necessary result of the doctrine then received of the absolute unity of the Church, as subsisting in the unity of its Episcopate. Hence it resulted that the orthodox decisions and canonical acts of any one Bishop were as if made and done by every Bishop in the world, and had the same efficacy in all parts of Christendom. The heresy justly censured in one place was considered to be denounced to all the world; the wretch separated lawfully from the communion of any one Bishop was cut off from the communion of every other Bishop also.

When Marcion, being excommunicated by his own father, the Bishop of Sinope in Pontus, betook himself to Rome, and sought admission there to the communion of the Church, the answer, according to Epiphanius, was: 'We cannot do so without the permission of your honoured father. For there is one faith and one consent, and we cannot run counter to our worthy brother in the ministry, your father.'[1] And we have still extant an encyclical letter of Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais, an obscure See, to the Bishops of the whole world, in which he desires them to take notice that he

---

[1] Οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐναντιωθῆναι τῷ καλῷ συλλειτουργῷ, πατρὶ δὲ σῷ. Epiphan. *Adv. Hær.* 1. t. iii. 2, vol. i. p. 303, D. ed. Petav.

has excommunicated a certain Andronicus, and to act accordingly. 'And if,' says he, 'any should despise this Church as being but of a little city, and receive those condemned by it, as though it were unnecessary to obey one so poor, let him know that he is making a schism in that Church which Christ willed to be one.'[2]

I have said that the orthodox decisions and just acts of each Bishop bound all the rest; and of course in every case the presumption was that a Bishop's decisions were orthodox, and his acts just and regular. Cyprian indeed appears sometimes to write upon the assumption that all a Bishop's decisions must be orthodox and all his proceedings just and regular; but he belongs to a rhetorical class of writers, in whose case we must deduct a large discount for exaggeration, in exchanging their statements for the more accurate language of calmer speakers. Certain it is that experience has abundantly shown that Bishops, even though regularly appointed to their places, may decide erroneously and act unjustly. And where such errors or acts of injustice were very gross and flagrant, it was soon felt to be an intolerable thing that the whole Church should be compromised by such erroneous or tyrannical proceedings. Hence in such cases the interference of neighbouring Bishops became necessary. But neighbouring Bishops were not always orthodox in their judgments or regular in their proceedings. A dispute originating in one Church might thus spread like a conflagration, until it had involved the whole Christian world in its blaze. Where was to be the ultimate appeal? Constantine thought he had solved this question when he assembled a General Council to decide the great dispute between Alexander and Arius. But soon it became evident how much he had been mistaken. A further question still remained: What was to be admitted as a General Council, proceeding fairly, and truly representing the Universal Church? Thus peace seemed as far distant as ever, and in the confusion, those who thought themselves wronged in one quarter fled to another.

---

[2] Synesii *Epist.* lxxii. Τοῖς ἐπισκόποις.

Those who were persecuted by a Patriarch fled to the Emperor, those who were persecuted by an Emperor sought refuge with a Patriarch; and the Patriarch most often able and willing to afford such shelter was the Bishop of Rome. For from an early period the Church of Rome held a position in temporal respects peculiarly advantageous. We find there from the first a Church wealthy and liberal of their wealth, and maintaining by that means a vast connection and dependence on themselves in very distant regions. We have in the second century, for example, the fragment of an Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth, in which he speaks in terms of the warmest gratitude of the assistance derived from Roman generosity. 'From the beginning,' he says, 'it has been your habit to benefit all the brethren in various ways, and to send supplies to many Churches in several cities, as well relieving the necessities of the indigent who are left as aiding those of the brethren who have been transported to the mines, preserving thus the hereditary tradition of Roman customs.' And it is remarkable that Eusebius, in reporting this letter, testifies to the continuation of the same liberality on the part of the Roman Church down to his own times.[3]

Rome in this respect stood in marked contrast to the old central Church of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was continually dependent upon succours from without, so that frequently in the Apostolic history we read of contributions sent from the remotest corners of the Christian world to the 'poor saints' in Judæa. Rome, on the contrary, was in the more blessed position of being able to give, rather than compelled to receive. It is manifest at a single glance what great influence this circumstance alone would give to the Roman See through the whole circle of Churches thus befriended by its bounty. It would give the Roman Prelates a natural claim to interpose their advice, and it would secure a respectful attention to that advice whenever it was offered. Already in Apostolic times we find 'saints' in Cæsar's household, and through all the succeeding persecutions the Church of Rome seems to have

---

[3] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 23.

contrived to retain some hold in such powerful quarters. The curious work of Hippolytus, lately discovered, incidentally throws some light upon the sources of wealth and influence open to the Roman See. There we find a wealthy Christian, a member of the imperial household, setting up one of his slaves as a banker, and that bank becoming a depository of the savings of Christian brethren and widows. We find the Bishop Victor able, through the influence of the Empress Marcia, to procure a large order of release of Christian captives condemned to the mines in Sardinia; and we find the Church taking upon itself the support of those liberated exiles when they returned.[4] As time goes on, and persecution is changed for favour on the part of the princes of this world, it is natural to expect that the prosperity of the Bishops of Rome should increase proportionately with the general prosperity of the whole Church; and accordingly we find, in the fourth century, the position of Bishop of Rome become so elevated as to be an object of ambition not inferior in attractiveness to the old secular dignities of the consulate or the prætorship, and contests between rival candidates agitating the ferocious passions of the populace, and breaking out into sanguinary feuds, that remind one of the bloody days of Sylla and Marius, and the triumvirs in the old Republic. Everything else had passed away from that fierce democracy; the old magistracies of consul and tribune had ceased to be elective, and would have been, since the imperial power had absorbed the rest, too trivial to be worth a contest even though they had continued elective. What had come in their place as a real living, potent, and popular magistracy was the Episcopate, and in the Bishop of Rome alone survived the remaining

---

[4] *Philosophumena*, ix. pp. 286–288, ed. Miller. Hippolytus calls Marcia not Empress but παλλακή, and she is called by most writers the concubine of Commodus. But the Bishop did not call her Empress without reason. Herodian, *Hist.* i. 50, speaking of the design of Commodus to appear in public equipped as a gladiator, says that 'he communicated this intention to Marcia, whom he respected most of his concubines, who differed in no manner from a married wife, and had all the honours of Augusta excepting the fire,' *i.e.* the fire usually carried in public before the Empress. She was thus virtually the Empress.—EDITORS.

energies of the Republic which had conquered the world. 'When I consider,' says Ammianus Marcellinus, in an often quoted passage, 'the splendour of the capital, I am not astonished that so valuable a prize should inflame the desires of ambitious men, and produce the fiercest and most obstinate contests. The successful candidate is secure that he will be enriched by the offerings of matrons, that as soon as his dress is composed with becoming care and elegance, he may proceed in his chariot through the streets of Rome; and that the sumptuousness of the imperial table will not equal the profuse and delicate entertainments provided by the taste and at the expense of the Roman pontiffs.'[5] Such was the prize which provoked the terrible civil war (it can scarcely be called by a less important title) between Damasus and Arsicinus, and between Liberius and Felix—conflicts during one of which a hundred and sixty dead bodies were left in a single church in Rome.

It was not only the oblations of the faithful in Rome itself which supplied these large revenues to its Prelates. We find by the fifth century distinct evidence of a property outside the city, so extensive and at that time so fixed, as to make it plain that it must have been growing and accumulating to that size for a long period previously. We find, at the time I speak of, the See of Rome possessed of large estates—patrimonies, as they were even then called—of St. Peter, not only in the Italian provinces which belonged immediately to the metropolitical chair of Rome, but in Gaul, in Spain, in Sardinia, in Africa, nay in Asia itself; estates managed by administrators called 'defensors,' who were in fact so many agents of Papal influence scattered throughout the Empire.

Occupying then such a position as this, the Bishop of the first City and of the wealthiest Church in the Empire, the visible representative of the leading Apostles and the inheritor of their tradition, it is not strange that in the disputes which followed the outbreak of the Arian controversy, and which

---

[5] Quoted from Gibbon, ch. xxv. See Ammian. Marcell. xxvii. 3, 14.

shook and agitated the whole East so fiercely, recourse should frequently have been had by all parties to the great Patriarch of the West. During these fierce disputes it is plain that not merely theologic dogmas engaged the zeal of the combatants, but that the rivalries of the great patriarchates—specially those of Constantinople and Alexandria—had their full share in exciting and embittering them. In these disputes the Bishop of Rome occupied an impregnable position, which enabled him to profit by the weaknesses of his brethren, and draw fresh strength from their losses to the consolidation of his own power. In every case he assumed the appearance of a judge in the last resort, and gradually familiarised men's minds with the conception of a tribunal of ultimate appeal from all injustice established at Rome. It is difficult to over-estimate the moral weight which the Popes derived in this way from the shelter which they were enabled to afford to Athanasius, the great Patriarch of Alexandria, when driven from his own See by the tyranny of the Emperor. This was a case which bound together the cause of Rome and the cause of orthodoxy, and brought out strongly the idea of a great central conservative power subsisting in Rome, as a rock upon which the Church might find steady support when all the rest of Christendom was giving way; and it placed in strong contrast the fidelity of the episcopal, and the unfaithfulness of the imperial head of the Church.

A similar advantage was gained by Rome when Chrysostom, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had recourse to the Roman Bishop to support him against the violence of Theophilus of Alexandria; and when, some twenty years later, Cyril of Alexandria sought from Pope Celestinus aid against the Patriarch of Constantinople.

But there is no reason to believe that in any of these cases did the parties make recourse to Rome as a supreme court of appeal in the Christian Church. They sought the assistance of the Roman, as they would have sought the assistance of any other Christian prelate, only the more eagerly because of his greater influence and higher character. It was the cir

cumstances of the times, the dissensions and the weakness of others, which brought the great Western Patriarch into this commanding position. It was the perilous condition of the Christian community—the danger in which the orthodox faith was of being trampled down and lost everywhere—which made men willing to allow a kind of temporary dictatorship to the Bishop of Rome; and if you will look a little narrowly into the circumstances of these times, you will not fail to perceive that it was only when supported by the public opinion of the Church, and considered as expressing it, that the Bishop of Rome ever successfully exercised this species of temporary dictatorship. His own claims to official and regular pre-eminence are for a long time put forward by no one but himself and his mere dependents. They are treated with utter scorn and contempt by those against whom he puts forth his pretended authority, and they are never acquiesced in by any-one one moment after they cease to be advantageous to his cause.

Nothing, it is evident, was further from the thoughts of Athanasius than the idea of any necessary dependence of the Church upon the Bishop of Rome. We have detailed polemic treatises of his in which such an idea must have come out if he had entertained any such idea. The times in which he wrote were times when the orthodox were in an apparent minority—when, as some one expressed the state of things, it was the world against Athanasius and Athanasius against the world—a state of things which eminently required some plain popular mark to be assigned, if any such could be assigned, to discriminate the Catholic from the heterodox communion. If Athanasius had really thought that the authority of the Roman Church was the very beacon divinely provided for that purpose—if he felt that he could with truth tell the bewildered laity, 'there is one conspicuous object patent to every eye—the mitre of the Roman Prelate—keep that steadily in view, and you cannot fail of being guided aright by it to the communion of the Catholic Church; other marks may mislead you, but this never can'—if, I say, Athanasius

had felt himself justified in giving these plain and easy directions to men perplexed by the general apostasy of all the leading prelates of the East—if he could have appealed to the principle that Rome is the centre of ecclesiastical unity as to a known and recognised maxim in the Church's tradition—is it credible that a man of his prudence in the management of controversy should have failed to make use of so decisive an advantage? That he never does so, under circumstances sure to call out such a reference if it could be made, is to me the plainest proof that Athanasius was ignorant of any such traditionary maxim.

But meanwhile, Athanasius' opponents are not satisfied to remain thus merely silent upon the subject of the Papal claims. When Pope Julius interfered to procure the restoration of Athanasius, and assumed in his letters to the Oriental Bishops that tone of superiority which he deemed suitable to the dignity of his See, they replied with indignation, that these matters were without the sphere of his control, and that he had no more reason to meddle with the question of the deposition of Athanasius, than they with that of the deposition of Novatus.[6] It is idle to say that these Bishops are of no weight because they were heterodox in condemning Athanasius. If their rejection of the Roman Bishop's authority had been as flagrant a violation of ecclesiastical tradition as their condemnation of Athanasius, we should have had the former handed down to us in the list of their heresies as well as the latter. All the other errors of the Arians would have appeared, in the catalogue of heresies, crowned and aggravated with that of rejecting the supremacy of the Popes. Is it not strange, if Romanism be the system of the Primitive Church, that neither in the case of the Arians, nor of any other parties, do we find this heresy attributed to anybody in the early ages?

Under this same Julius was held that famous Council of Sardica, the alleged canons of which hold such a prominent place in all discussions with respect to the Papal supremacy.

---

[6] Sozom. *Eccl. Hist.* iii. 3.

It has been seriously questioned whether the Council passed any canons at all upon this subject; and you will find in a collection of tracts by a very forcible writer, Dr. M. Geddes, some strong arguments urged against their genuineness. Into that question, however, I do not mean now to enter. Whether genuine or forged, they are, I think, but comparatively timid attempts to lay the foundations of a supremacy. They are obviously not what lawyers would call declaratory acts—setting forth and recognising what is already the law; but new measures which the disorders of the Church appeared to require. Matters seemed to the Synod to make it evident that a regular tribunal of appeal in the case of disputes between Bishops should be fixed somewhere, and therefore they propose, as the most expedient course, that in honour of the Apostle Peter's memory, it should be lodged in Rome. The tone of the decree is highly characteristic of the policy of the Roman See at that time—its careful avoidance of resting its claims to precedence upon the more obvious ground of the capital city, and choosing to fix them upon the memory of its Apostolic founder. This was a policy sagaciously conceived. In truth, the position of Rome as the imperial city could give no permanent and indefeasible rights to the Church. The elevation of Constantinople to the rank of a second capital, the growing greatness of such neighbours as Ravenna, and Milan, and Treves, and Arles—these were emphatic warnings to the Bishops of Rome to seek some more stable ground for their supremacy than the changing one of civil pre-eminence; and by such warnings they did not fail to profit. They made common cause with the other Sedes Apostolicæ against the upstart dignity of Constantinople, which had nothing but its metropolitan splendour to make it illustrious; and when the Council of Chalcedon[7] placed new and old Rome on a par, as the two Churches of the two capitals of the Empire, the Bishop of Rome repudiated any such ground of his claims, and dexterously suggested to his brother of Antioch that he was unjustly set aside from the second throne in the hier-

---

[7] Canon xxviii.

archy by the intrusion of such non-Apostolical foundations as Constantinople and Alexandria.[8]

But to return to this Sardican decree; its language is well worthy of attention. 'If,' Hosius, the president, is made to say to the Sardican Fathers, 'any Bishop may seem to be unjustly condemned, let us, if it seem well, honour the memory of Peter the Apostle, and let a report be written by those who have judged the cause to Julius Bishop of Rome, so that if necessary the trial may be renewed by the neighbouring Bishops of the province.'[9]

There is nothing here to justify the idea of a supremacy vested by a divine right in the Roman Pontiff. The decree seems on the face of it an experiment. It mentions Julius by name, and seems to contemplate so entirely the time then present, as not to extend its view farther than the then existing Pope. It gives a right of interference only in *causis Episcoporum*, where some impartial arbitrator would seem absolutely necessary; and the right which it gives is not such as Rome afterwards exercised of transferring the whole inquiry to her own bar, but simply of deciding whether or not a new trial should be holden by the Bishops of the neigh-

---

[8] S. Leonis, *Epist.* lii., ad Anatolium Ep. Const.; liv., ad Martianum Augustum; lxii., ad Maximum Antiochenum Episcopum. It is to be observed that in the second of these letters, to the Emperor Martianus, Leo styles himself 'Episcopus Romanæ et Universalis Ecclesiæ.' On this Baronius, *Ann.* ad. An. 451, vol. vi. p. 162 A.B., observing the apparent contradiction to it of the assertion of Gregory the Great, that none of his predecessors had used the title of Œcumenical, suggests that Gregory only meant that they had not used it solemnly, always and in all inscriptions and subscriptions. But in fact there is no contradiction. Every Bishop is not only a Bishop of his own, but also of the Universal Church, which is all that Leo ascribed to himself. This is very different from the titles condemned by Gregory. His phrases are,—'Hoc universitatis nomen.—Superbum et pestiferum œcumenicon, hoc est universalis sibi vocabulum usurpasse.—Universalitatis nomen quod sibi illicitè usurpavit.—Episcopus appetas solus vocari.—Nefandum elationis vocabulum.—Nullus enim Patriarcharum hoc tam profano vocabulo unquam utatur: quia si summus Patriarcha universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur.' See p. 162 A, and vol. vii. pp. 681, 682. In VIII. p. 92 B, Baronius himself says that Gregory recognised the difference between the titles, Universal Bishop, and Bishop of the Universal Church.—EDITORS.

[9] Sard. Can. iii.

bourhood where the alleged wrong had occurred. And it might seem, not unreasonably, that the very circumstance which made the Oriental Bishops so impatient of their Western brother's interference,—his remoteness from the scene of conflict,—would tend to make him a safer and more impartial umpire to appeal to in such disputes.

But be this as it may, these Decrees of Sardica, if they ever had existence, certainly seem to have had no general reception in the Church. Nothing but a General Council could possibly have given force to a decree like this, intended to bind the whole Church; and the Synod of Sardica was very far indeed removed from the character of a General Council. It was a mere particular Synod. The Oriental Bishops had severed themselves from the Western before these canons were passed, if passed they ever were, and the prelates assembled at Sardica could with no decency even pretend to represent more than the Occidental portion of Christendom.

Certainly, when in 403 Chrysostom made his appeal, it was in no way founded on the Sardican canons, nor was it made to the Bishop of Rome as having any regular superiority over the Universal Church, nor indeed was it made exclusively to the Bishop of Rome at all. In the end of his letter to Innocent, Chrysostom expressly says that he had sent a similar one to Venesius, Bishop of Milan, and Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia. It was the cry of one Catholic Bishop oppressed by the tyranny of his enemies, addressed to his brother prelates who were most likely and most able to assist him.

And if, in point of fact, during the period of which we are now speaking, such appeals were commonly made from the East to the West, this was the result of the circumstance I have before alluded to—the circumstance that while the East was convulsed and distracted by perpetual disputes and schisms, the West for the most part stood firm and collected under its regular ecclesiastical officers, and persevered in the constant profession of the same traditionary orthodoxy.

Indeed no one can fail to perceive that the whole weight

of the Roman Prelates' decision in these cases depended upon the nature of that decision—its agreement I mean, or disagreement, with the prevailing opinion and feeling of the Church. And in these cases, in which their usual courage or sagacity failed the Roman Bishops, their decisions were no more respected than if they had issued from Ptolemais or Eugubium instead of the great Western See of Peter.

When Liberius, for example, gave way for a time under the threats of the Emperor, and joined in the excommunication of Athanasius, the voice which speaking in the language of orthodoxy could have brought the whole West to rally round it, was now utterly disregarded. And the same thing is perhaps still more observable in the cases of Vigilius and Honorius.

In the case of Vigilius we know that upon his consenting to condemn what were called the three Chapters, the greater part of the West absolutely refused his authority, the Bishops of Istria persisting in their separation from the Roman Church long after, even for seventy years; and in the case of Honorius we are met with the strange phenomenon of a Pope solemnly anathematised as a heretic by a General Council—that of Constantinople, in 680.

It cannot be doubted, I think, that if the Greek Emperors could have retained the command of Italy which Justinian enforced, the Roman Patriarch would ultimately have sunk into as completely subservient, and otherwise a far less brilliant position than his brother and rival at Constantinople. The separation of the West from the East is the true epoch of the supremacy of the Popes. When the view of the Western Church was bounded by its own limited horizon, when the great luminaries of the Eastern Patriarchates were habitually hidden from men's eyes, and when the sun of the Imperial power had quitted their quarter of the heavens entirely, then it was the Roman See began to wear, as an inalienable property, its exclusive prerogative. But in the meantime it had been preparing circumstances for making the full development of its power possible.

LECTURE V.

DIFFICULTIES OF UNIVERSAL EMPIRE—NO CENTRAL AUTHORITY FOR THREE HUNDRED YEARS IN THE IDEA OF CHURCH UNITY—FORGED DECRETALS.

Gentlemen,—What should be the size of a particular Church is a question that has been long and fiercely agitated by divines, and which seems as little capable of any single uniform solution as the famous problem, to find the proper length of a rope. The size of a particular Church seems to be determined by much the same sort of circumstances, partly physical, partly moral, as determine the size of a State. In both cases a speculative inquirer may raise innumerable difficulties about the question in the abstract, but in both cases practical men feel little difficulty in disposing of such matters in the concrete.

In imagination we can conceive an universal empire established in the world, and all the various regions of the habitable globe equally and immediately subjected to one central presiding will; but in fact it is soon found that nature sets limits to the possibility of the realisation of such an idea, though it is not easy to define precisely where such limits begin to be necessary, and tell why that which has been successfully pushed up to a certain point, may not be pushed to another and another point beyond it. What the limits of an empire are—I mean the necessary limits—it is very hard to say; but that there is such a thing as a state becoming unwieldy by its size, and breaking in pieces from too great an extension of territory, is what experience makes too certain to admit of doubt. Experience shows that in all such cases the grasp of the central government over its de-

pendencies becomes weaker and weaker as they become remote, not merely in space, but in the complexity of their interests, in their need and in their capacity of self-government, in the difference of their interests from that of the centre; and that in such cases the result of attempts to tighten that grasp is that the hand is forced to resign them altogether. 'Three thousand miles,' said Burke, when seeking to persuade the English Parliament to conciliate its refractory colonies, 'three thousand miles of ocean lie between you and America. No contrivance can prevent the effect of this distance in weakening government. Seas roll, and months pass, between the order and the execution; and the want of a speedy explanation of a single point is enough to defeat a whole system. Who are you, that you should fret and rage and bite the chains of nature? Nothing worse happens to you than does to all nations who have extensive empires, and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In large bodies the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities. Nature has said it. The Turk cannot govern Egypt and Arabia and Curdistan as he governs Thrace: nor has he the same dominion in Crimea and Algiers as he has in Brusa and in Smyrna. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The Sultan gets such obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein that he may govern at all; and the whole of the force and vigour of his authority in his centre is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. Spain, in her provinces, is perhaps not so well obeyed as you are in yours. She complies too; she submits, she watches times. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law, of extensive and detached empire.'

What Burke has thus eloquently expressed with respect to civil, is true in its proportion, of ecclesiastical power also. There, too, nature has fixed barriers in the shape of distance, difference of language, modes of thought, habits and interests, which limit within fixed bounds the intensity (so to speak) of any central power, and render the dependence of some of its subjects upon it little more than nominal. We all

know, for example, that though the Maronites are, and the Lithuanians were, in communion with the Bishop of Rome, yet their connection with his See was little better than a formal homage. In these remote provinces of the Church, despotism itself—to borrow Burke's forcible language—'despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The Pope gets such an obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein that he may govern at all.' To give to an ecclesiastical community that compactness of union, that perfect connection of the parts, that penetration of all the limbs by a power emanating from the centre of the frame, which the scheme of Romanism requires, conditions are demanded which cannot practically be found except within certain limits. The Roman is essentially as much a National Church as the British: only, the national character which made the Roman system prevalent through Europe was more general, more extensively imprinted, than the British. Still, it was a certain national character which lay at the foundation of the boasted unity of the Roman communion. It was the character which an Oriental would immediately recognise as that of the Frankish nation, a character which, like a family likeness, is much more readily recognised at first sight by strangers than by those who bear it themselves, because the members of such a family or nation have their attention more directed to the diversities by which they are distinguished from one another than to the traits of similarity between themselves. The character of which I speak as being imprinted upon the mass of the people of continental Europe (always excluding Russia, and what are now the Turkish dominions), was the result of that blending of the institutions of the old Roman Empire, of the Church, and of the barbaric codes and constitutions, which took place in those obscure ages wherein so much was done and so little was said or written. Wherever this mediæval character has been wanting in the subject matter to be wrought upon, there the development of Romanism has been proportionably weak and imperfect; and in all cases, as at present for example notably, Romanism

seems practically to acknowledge that a reproduction of mediævalism, a return backward of the human mind to a point long since past, is absolutely needful for preserving and reviving its power. This is one of the circumstances which most manifestly show that Romanism has not in truth that Catholicity which it boasts; because as progress is clearly the law of the human race, a truly Catholic religion cannot be one essentially connected with any one stage in that progress any more than with any one spot on the world's surface, but one which will continually reveal itself as more and more suitable to mankind, according as mankind advance from one stage of improvement to another. The apparent unity of the Roman system is obtained by arbitrarily rejecting from all claim to Church connection whatever will not readily amalgamate with that system: it is a theory that excludes the phenomena which it cannot reconcile: it is a parent that disowns the children whom he cannot support.

In effect, the whole notion of the unity of the Church as consisting in subordination to a visible central authority, grew up out of the peculiar circumstances of the Roman Empire, which, by making nearly the whole of Christendom one State, made it possible, and to some extent convenient, to deal with it as, in this sense, one Church also.

It has been supposed indeed by some that the original platform of the Church was of this kind, that it contained one fixed central tribunal for the whole world, and that that was the College of the Apostles assembled in Jerusalem. There is some slight glimpse of verisimilitude lent to this hypothesis by one or two incidents recorded in the Evangelic history; but on a few moments' reflection all colour of probability thence derived will speedily disappear. While the Apostles were together, they would of course act together; they would profit by that temporary circumstance to avail themselves of each other's counsel and advice. But there is so far from being anything to show that their meeting thus together, or constituting in such a sense a college or council, was part of the divine plan, that there is everything to lead

us to a contrary conclusion. Their original mission was to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; their residence in Jerusalem was only required until they should be endowed with power from on high; and though in fact it continued longer, yet from that time forth it was merely accidental. Throughout Judæa and its confines the gospel might be advantageously propagated by the united labours of the Twelve for some time after the descent of the Holy Ghost, and it does seem as if the whole community of Christians within certain limits constituted at that time one Church in this sense; and the old reading of Acts ix. 31 is perhaps the correct one—*the Church* throughout Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria. And this would be quite natural in the case of a community like the Christian, developed out of Judaism. The Christians were at first coincident with the Jewish nation; they were the *ἐκκλησία* of Israel acknowledging their Messiah; and how tenaciously this national conception of the Church was attached to men's minds appears from the obstinacy with which a large party contended that the Gentiles could only obtain the privileges of the gospel through the door of proselytism; and it would appear, I think, that even with those who did not insist upon the circumcision of a believing Gentile, the thought of his connection with the Church still for a long time was that of a more liberal proselytism indeed, but still a proselytism—an admission to share in privileges which primarily, and in some peculiar sense, belonged to the Jews, and therefore involving some kind of dependence upon Israel after the flesh. But this state of things was, as I said, temporary and accidental. Circumstances soon rendered it impossible that the distant communities of Christians should maintain any regular dependence upon Jerusalem; and if the human wisdom of any at that time had conceived the plan of such a dependence, it was soon as completely frustrated by Providence as the design of fixing a centre for all mankind at Babel. From the time that the gospel is preached freely and extensively among the Gentiles, we find the structure of the Christian community

accommodating itself to the civil ideas of the people among whom it was planted. We have no longer the Church in Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria, but the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Cilicia—each town, according to the republican ideas of Greek civilisation, forming a self-governed community of its own. And as the labours of Paul bring into existence a continually increasing multitude of such Churches, we see him founding, confirming, and directing them, governing them without control, and deciding without appeal, in such a manner as wholly to exclude the notion of his being other than independent in his Apostolic office, and to show that, though he might choose to consult with other Apostles when the opportunity presented itself, he was not necessarily obliged to make any reference to his colleagues. Indeed, every year that passed over the early Church made it more and more evident that any fixed central authority was impracticable, for every year was tending to break up all connection between Judæa and the rest of the world, by hastening on that terrible war in which the Apostolic age closed. And if it were true that a central authority for the whole Church were the platform of that age, the two circumstances that that authority was placed in Jerusalem, and vested in the whole College of the Apostles, would suffice to make it evident that it was not intended to survive that age, since Jerusalem and the College of Apostles were extinguished together before its termination without any inspired provision having been made for indicating what or who was to supply their place. This, I think, would be the legitimate inference if there had been any such central authority as some contend for. But there was not. The Apostles formed a college only accidentally. They acquired no new power by being together, they lost none by being separate. Nor does the circumstance that Apostles and Prophets are called the foundation of the Church, or that Apostles are said to have been set first; neither of these circumstances, I say, tends in any degree to prove that as a college they constituted by divine appointment a central ruling authority. A foundation and a government are wholly distinct ideas.

Romulus, indeed, was both founder and king of Rome; but he was not founder as he was king, or king as he was founder. And even if in these cases the Scripture were speaking of a frame of church government at all—which it is not—speaking of 'apostles' in the plural would no more prove that they constituted a senate, or should all be assembled together, than speaking of prophets, evangelists, pastors in the same way proves such a conclusion with respect of them. God, says Paul, hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, then workers of miracles, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. We cannot infer from this that he contemplated the Apostles as conjointly constituting a senate, unless we infer that he contemplated in like manner all the prophets, all the miracle-workers, all the speakers with tongues, all the other officers of the Church throughout the world, as so many colleges who were to assemble for joint deliberation and combined decision.

Nowhere, indeed, in the image which the New Testament presents of the unity of the Church, is the thought of any one central government on earth brought before us at all. It is a unity of faith and knowledge, of heart and conduct, of participation in the same Spirit through the same outward means—this is the unity of the body of Christ which is here brought under our notice. And the language of succeeding Christians for a long time retains the simplicity of this primitive conception. The idea of one central government for the whole community never once enters into the conception of the unity of the Universal Church which seems to have been framed by Christian teachers for three hundred years after the Apostles. You will see this proved invincibly in a treatise of the highest importance in the Romish controversy, because one which lays down fundamental principles —I mean Dr. Barrow's Discourse on the Unity of the Church. I have not time to go into the details which would be necessary to exhibit the evidence of this assertion here, but by examining the references you will there find, you may easily satisfy yourselves that, as I said, a central government formed

1867443

no part of the primitive conception of the unity of the Church. A participation of the common faith, a propagation as one continuous body from the Apostles, an interchange of mutual good offices, a use of the same Sacraments and the same Scriptures—these are the chief component parts of the idea of the unity of the whole confraternity of Christians as contemplated by the earlier writers. It is an idea of which, in their controversies with the heretics, they are very frequently led to speak; and if the thought of a central government had formed any part of it, it surely could not have failed to show itself upon some occasion when they professedly undertook to expound its nature.

Indeed it is one of the difficulties of the Papal scheme that such a vigorous central government, and such a total dependence of the Church upon it as it supposes, requires for its realisation far more temporal prosperity to the Church than men ever saw before the age of Constantine. Such a church government is a kingdom of this world, or at least is necessarily dependent on a kingdom of this world. For it is manifest that with a widely diffused community, scattered over distant regions, the connection of the members with the head as a body politic—the power of communicating with, consulting, and obeying that central power—must be liable to be continually interrupted by the temporal governments of those regions through which those members are scattered. The Bishop of Rome could not have ruled monarchically the whole Church before Constantine, the thing was physically impossible; and so, even still more, was a General Council. So that if, to have a central authority capable of binding and directing the whole Church be essential to a realisation of its unity, then the Church was left without such an essential for more than three hundred years. But, as I said, nothing of the kind was essential; from the first it was an unessential matter, and to be determined by circumstances, how far and to what extent Christians should coalesce into communities under the same government, and within what limits a subordination of jurisdiction should be established. Gradually we find the

Churches more and more accommodating themselves to the structure of the state, until when the state becomes Christian, the Church too acquires a possibility of united action as one body corporate, and by the will of the Emperor the first General Council is assembled; and thenceforward for some time the image of the Church is that of one great corporate body co-extensive with the state, and finding its culminating point in the same eminence—the imperial supremacy. And this continues pretty much the state of things so long as the hand of the Emperor is firm enough to hold the vast body politic together. But soon it becomes evident that a dissolution of its parts is inevitable, and that the East and West must part company. And it was this withdrawal of the imperial grasp which left the West without any other central authority than that which the Bishop of Rome was ready to afford it. It is a remarkable and significant fact that the same Pope who consummated the separation of the West from the East, was he who recognised the forged Decretals as the law of the Church. I speak of Nicolas I. By the first of these the bounds of the visible Church were for the first time limited to the regions dependent on the See of Rome, the whole of the Greek communion being involved in the heresy of denying the double procession, as well as in the schism of recognising Photius; and by the second a speedy advantage was taken of that separation to pass upon Western Christendom a forgery which, with free communication between the East and West, could never have maintained its credit for a day.

The Decretals of Isidore are a document to which no respectable Roman Catholic writer of the present day attaches the least credit; and yet they undeniably formed one of the most potent influences by which the monarchical power of the Popes over the Western Church was established. Up to this period the Decretals, the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome, according to the authorised or common edition of Dionysius, commenced with Pope Siricius towards the end of the fourth century. To the collection of Dionysius was added that of the authentic Councils which bore the name of Isidore

of Seville. On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest Popes, from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the Councils from Silvester to Gregory XI., thirty-nine false Decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic Councils. 'In this vast manual,' says Dean Milman, 'of sacerdotal Christianity, the Popes appear from the first as guardians, parents, legislators of the faith throughout the world. The false Decretals do not merely assert the supremacy of the Popes—the dignity and privileges of the Bishops of Rome—they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the Sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the Cross, the discovery of the relics of the Apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The whole is composed with the air of profound piety and reverence; a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandisement of the See of Rome; . . but for the monstrous ignorance of history which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable; the false Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up

by all; not a voice is raised in their favour; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their day and throughout the later history of Christianity.

'The author or (authors) of this most audacious and elaborate of pious frauds is unknown; the date and place of compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The false Decretals came not from Rome; the time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain. In one year Nicolas I. is apparently ignorant of their existence, the next he speaks of them with full knowledge. They contain words manifestly used at the Council of Paris, A.D. 829, consequently are of later date; they were known to the Levite Benedict of Mentz, who composed a Supplement to the Capitularies of Adgesil, between A.D. 840–847. The city of Mentz is designated with nearly equal certainty as the place in which, if not actually composed, they were first promulgated as the canon law of Christendom.

'The state of affairs in the divided and distracted Empire might seem almost to call for, almost to justify, this desperate effort to strengthen the ecclesiastical power. All the lower clergy, including some of the bishops, were groaning just at the time under heavy oppression. By the Constitution of Charlemagne . . . the clergy were under strict subordination to the bishop, the bishop to the metropolitan, and the metropolitan only to the Emperor. Conflicting Popes, or Popes in conflict with Italian enemies, or with their own subjects, had reduced the Papacy to vassalage under the Empire; conflicting kings, on the division of the realm of Charlemagne, had not yet, but were soon about to submit the Empire to the Roman supremacy. All at present was anarchy. The Germans and the French were drawing asunder into separate rival nations; the sons of Louis were waging an endless, implacable strife; almost every year, less than every decad of

years, beheld a new partition of the Empire; kingdoms rose and fell; took new boundaries, acknowledged new sovereigns; no government was strong enough to maintain the law; might was the only law. The hierarchy, if not the whole clergy, had taken the lead in the disruption of the unity of the Empire; they had abased the throne of Louis; they were for a short disastrous period now the victims of that abasement. Their wealth was their danger. They had become secular princes, they had become nobles, they had become vast landed proprietors; but during the civil wars it was not the persuasive voice but the strong arm, which had authority; the mitre must bow before the helmet, the crozier before the sword: not only the domains, the persons of the clergy had lost their sanctity. The persecution and oppression of the Church and the clergy had reached a height unknown in former times. Thus writes Bishop Agobard of Lyons:—"No condition of men, whether free or unfree, is so insecure in the possession of his property as the priest. No one can foresee how many days he may be master of his church, of his house. Not only the estates of the Church, the churches themselves are sold." The Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle, (A.D. 826), protested against the contempt into which the clergy had fallen with the ungodly laity. They wrote in bitter remonstrance to King Pepin, the son of Louis,—"There are people who boldly say, 'Where hath God ordained that the goods of which the priests claim possession are consecrated to Him? The whole earth is the Lord's; has He not created it for the good of all mankind?'" The metropolitans alone . . . stood above the tumults, themselves if not tyrants or instruments of royal tyranny, either trampling on the inferior clergy, or, at least, not protecting them from being trampled on or plundered by others.

'It might occur to the most religious that for the sake of religion; it might occur to those to whom the dignity and interest of the sacerdotal order were their religion, that some effort must be made to reinvest the clergy in their imperilled sanctity. There must be some appeal against this secular, this ecclesiastical tyranny: and whither should appeal be?

It could not be to the Scriptures, to the Gospel; it must be to ancient and venerable tradition, to the unrepealed, irrepealable, law of the Church; to remote and awful Rome. Rome must be proclaimed in an unusual, more emphatic manner, the eternal, immemorial court of appeal; the tradition must not rest on the comparatively recent names of Leo the Great, of Innocent the Great, of Siricius, or the right of appeal depend on the decree of the Council of Sardica; it must come down from the successors of St. Peter himself in unbroken succession; the whole clergy must have a perpetual, indefeasible sanctity of the same antiquity.'[1]

Altogether, however, this of the false Decretals is one of the most audacious as well as one of the most successful forgeries ever perpetrated. In audacity it is in some respects equalled by, in others went far beyond that of the Apostolic Constitutions; in success it went immeasurably beyond them. And the superior success of the false Decretals reflects little honour on the intelligence of the mass of the clergy or the honesty of the Popes.

Such was the uncritical ignorance which now prevailed generally in the West, that the great body of the clergy may have been really imposed upon by this flagrant forgery. Even in the seventeenth century a Jesuit was found to defend its claims to authenticity.[2] But whoever else was imposed on, the Popes could hardly have been. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of Councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, and on which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent. Yet, as soon as they become known to the Popes, they are eagerly embraced as genuine title-deeds of their inheritance; they are incorporated into the canon law of the Church, and are cited without reserve by a whole line of Pontiffs as conclusive evidence upon the points with which they are concerned.

---

[1] Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. pp. 374-377.

[2] Franciscus Turrianus - Della Torre, a Spaniard.

LECTURE VI.

CAUSES THAT MADE THE RECEPTION OF THE DECRETALS POSSIBLE—GREGORY VII.

GENTLEMEN,—I called your attention, at the close of my last lecture, to that extraordinary collection of documents, the false Decretals. And I observed that ignorant, grossly ignorant as the age was in which they were published, such a forgery as that could not have gained credence in the Western Church if there had not been strong predisposing influences at work to make men's minds ready to receive the idea of a Papal theocracy which it presents. Though the empire of the Popes as it flourished in the middle ages was, to a greater extent than the Ultramontanes are willing to allow, founded upon those documents, yet it certainly was not founded upon them alone; nor could it have been founded on them at all if they had not been braced and strengthened by the addition of some firmer materials. Of the grossness of that forgery I have already endeavoured to convey some general notion, but a particular instance will perhaps accomplish my purpose still better. Here then is one, adopted into the recognised body of the Canon Law, the ecclesiastical code of Western Christendom, as part of an Epistle addressed by Anacletus about the year 84 to all the Bishops of the world.

'The most Holy Roman and Apostolic Church hath obtained the primacy, not from the Apostles but from Christ Himself, and has won an eminence of power over all the Churches and the whole flock of Christian people; as He Himself said to Peter, Thou art Peter &c. The fellowship also of the blessed Apostle Paul, that vessel of election, was added in this same city of Rome; who in one day and at the same

time with Peter, was crowned with a glorious martyrdom under the Emperor Nero. These two Apostles consecrated the Roman Church, and preferred it by their presence and their triumph to all the other cities of the whole world. And though the prayer of all the saints be poured forth perpetually for all, yet the blessed Paul expressly, under his own hand, makes this promise to the Romans: For God is my witness, whom I serve in the gospel of His Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers. The first See therefore, by heavenly gifts, is that of the Roman Church. The second is at Alexandria consecrated in Peter's name by Mark, his disciple and evangelist, who, under Peter's direction, first preached in Egypt, and obtained a glorious martyrdom, and was succeeded by Abilius. The third See is that of Antioch, made venerable by the name of the same Apostle Peter, because he dwelt there before he came to Rome, and made Ignatius bishop there; and because there first the name of Christians was given to the new race. Amongst the Apostles there was a certain difference; and though all were Apostles, yet it was granted to Peter by the Lord (and indeed they themselves wished the same) that he should preside over the other Apostles, and should possess the Cephas, i.e. the head and chiefty of the Apostolate; and they handed down the same form to be observed by their successors and the rest of the Bishops. This Apostolic See was constituted the hinge and head of all Churches by the Lord and not by another; and as the door is governed by the hinge, so are (by God's will) all Churches governed by the authority of this.'

I think, in spite of all their modern apologists have said, it is not too much to call those ages 'dark' in which such stuff as this could be successfully palmed upon the Bishops of Verdun as the genuine production of Anacletus in the first century. And even in that dark age there must, as I said, have been some special causes co-operating to make the success of such an imposture possible. Let us now turn our attention to some of these.

To the great mass of the European States which rose upon the ruin of the Roman Empire in the West, Rome really was, to a great extent, what she absurdly claims to be universally, the mother and mistress of all their Churches. And be it remembered, it was not the Rome of primitive times, but the Rome of the Leos and the Gregories, Rome full of the idea of her own supremacy, that had thus the moulding of the faith of nearly the whole of Western Christendom. In some places, indeed, the freer traditions of the elder Church lingered amongst the remains of former Christians not extirpated by the barbarian invaders,—and in all such cases we find the spirit of independence more or less active,—thus clearly indicating the source from which the new principles were derived. And of this freer tradition, inherited apparently from some Oriental source, the instances of the Irish and old British Churches will at once occur to you. But in general, as I said, Rome had directly or indirectly the moulding of the faith of the Christianised barbarians in her own hands, and she did not fail to profit by the golden opportunity. The supremacy of the Roman Bishop as the legitimate heir of the spiritual monarchy of St. Peter was almost the first element of the Christian faith as propagated by her missionaries. The image of the great Apostle, with his keys as the porter of heaven, was placed vividly before the barbarous minds of the new converts, and they were taught to see in the Pope the earthly administrator of that awful power. Ludicrous as it may appear to us, there can be no doubt that the reasoning ascribed to King Oswy at the Synod of Whitby prevailed in determining many a man's implicit submission to the Roman See. Colman, the Bishop of Lindisfarne, had urged the tradition of St. John for the Irish mode of celebrating Easter. He was of course confronted by the rival authority of St. Peter, who it was significantly added, has the keys of heaven. The hint was readily seized by the king. 'Do you,' he asked Colman, 'acknowledge that St. Peter has the keys of heaven?' 'Unquestionably!' replied Colman. 'Then for my part,' said Oswy, 'I will hold

to St. Peter, lest, when I offer myself at those gates, he should shut them against me.'[1]

A local centre, too, it must be remembered, and a living, visible, prophetic authority, easily recognisable, are things naturally congenial to the human mind, but specially to the semi-barbarous mind. The faith of the Roman Church was a ready and facile index of orthodoxy, and the minds of the barbarians, as averse to religious as they were prone to secular contentions, could not be easily satisfied by any less accessible or less conspicuous mark. They wanted a short road to right belief, which should require no time or painful attention to discover it, and such a short road they found in believing as the Bishop of Rome believed. They could not, like the Eastern Bishops, take an interest in the excitement of religious disputation, and wait till a controversy was fought out, through a whole polemical campaign, in the skirmishes of single Bishops, or the pitched battles of Synodical Assemblies. They wanted a guide who should take all this trouble off their minds, and they found him, as they thought, in the successor of St. Peter. For where in the West could any rival be pointed out? Its consecration by the martyrdom of the great Apostles; its venerable name; its mysterious union of still unforgotten civil with ecclesiastical pre-eminence; its very remoteness as a shrine to be visited by pious pilgrims; its superior civilisation; its treasuries of learning and wisdom; all these circumstances threw an awful kind of majesty around Rome, which could not fail to make a deep impression upon a mythic age, when men's minds were in the condition of imaginative children, and give to the Papal See the character of an oracle of heaven established upon earth. Thus the idea of reverence for the Pope, as the Spiritual Father of Christendom, was wrought into men's minds from their infancy as part of their religion; nay, as the very foundation of their religion; since it was as the tradition of St. Peter, as the faith propounded by the Holy See, that their creed itself was received.

The immense advantages thus conceded to the Bishop of

---

[1] Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. 25.

Rome in the struggle he was about to make for a theocratic temporal authority, as head of the Christian nation, were certainly not foreseen by the barbarous princes who thus readily conceded them. But those advantages were indeed enormous. Once it became fully understood by the people of Europe that out of the Church there was no salvation, and that to be in the Church it was necessary to be in communion with the Bishop of Rome, there was prepared and placed in his hands a tremendous thunderbolt, which a daring and unscrupulous Pontiff might launch with terrible effect against the thrones of princes. And nothing, I think, can show more clearly how strongly this idea of the necessity of union with the See of Rome had wrought itself into the mind of Europe, than the circumstance that, throughout that long and fierce battle, waged for whole centuries between the Empire and the Popedom, never until the period of the Reformation did the idea of breaking communion with Rome seem to present itself as a possible enterprise to any sovereign. The only remedies for Papal tyranny that occurred were either to coerce the individual Pontiff into submission by brute force, or to get him deposed and another set up in his place by a Council of Bishops. To a mind duly penetrated indeed with Christian principles, it might seem that a persuasion of the infallibility of the Pope, in the strictest sense, is the legitimate and inevitable development of a conception of him as the necessary centre of ecclesiastical unity. A supernatural gift of this kind conferred on the Pope would appear to such a mind necessarily required by the circumstances of the case, since to such a mind it would appear repugnant to reason to suppose that Christ would make men's salvation dependent upon the caprices of one who, as far as mere natural qualifications went, might often be ignorant and vicious, and compel men, under pain of damnation, to shun, by every concession, the excommunication of a person whose demands might be utterly unrighteous and even impious. But the coarse understandings of the soldier-princes of the middle ages were not staggered by such alarming consequences. The popular conception of

the spiritual powers of the Church was of a kind of magical influence belonging to churchmen in virtue of their office, and which depended not for its efficacy upon the reasons for which, or the dispositions with which, it was wielded. Peter was to be submitted to not because what he commanded was necessarily right, but because he had the keys and might shut the refractory out of heaven. Church-censures were regarded as a kind of spell, which, when duly performed according to all the proper ceremonies, and by the proper person, had a sort of physical effect. It might be controlled by a higher spell of some superior magician, or the arch-enchanter might be seized and bound and forced to reverse his incantations; but as to utterly denying his power, that would have been to shake the very foundations of the Christianity of those ages, as it subsisted in Western Europe.

The main checks, then, which the Imperial power could exercise over the Papal were either, (1) direct coercion of the Pope, by getting his person into the Emperor's hands; or (2) indirect coercion by intimidating the great prelates and inferior clergy through whom the Papal rescripts were to be issued, and who were the immediate representatives of the Church in the eyes of the people.

The grand aim, then, of the founders of the Papal theocracy was to emancipate themselves from both these modes of control by securing (1) their independent stability in their own Italian princedom, and (2) the total dependence of the whole clerical order throughout Europe on themselves, and themselves alone. What enabled them to carry out these bold plans was a strong reaction in public feeling from the gross secularism which prevailed during the beginning of the eleventh century. Never had the Papacy fallen so low as at the beginning of that century; never had it risen so high as it did before its close.

For a long disastrous interval the power of creating the Popes had fallen into the polluted hands of the Italian princes, and by them had been almost openly set up to auction for the highest bidder. The consequence was a succession of Pontiffs

who were a disgrace not to the chair of Peter only, but to human nature—men, if they can be called men, whose monstrous iniquity can only be paralleled by that of the worst and most despicable in the catalogue of the Roman Emperors—Pontiffs so notoriously abominable that the only resource left to Baronius, in describing those lamentable times, is the ingenious one of converting their very depravity into a proof of the continuance of divine guidance to his Church; since nothing, he observes, could be a more illustrious miracle than the maintenance of the Roman See while such monsters were doing everything in their power to destroy it.[2] And such as Rome was, such, to a fearful extent, was the rest of the Church dependent on it. The whole head was sick and the whole heart faint. Open simony, gross ignorance, unblushing immorality, hardly-dissembled contempt for their own sacred functions, characterised too generally the great prelates and the inferior clergy throughout Europe; and bishops in many cases were hardly distinguishable from the temporal barons around them. At the crisis of this frightful corruption, the known good character and piety of the Emperor Henry III. enabled him once more to vindicate the proper sacred privileges of the imperial dignity, to wrest the appointment of the Pope from the Roman barons, and to take it into his own hands. And from him reluctant Italy was compelled to receive a succession of German Pontiffs—Clement II., Damasus II., Leo IX., and Victor II.—who set themselves earnestly to reform the Church and restore a healthier moral tone. During the pontificate of the last of these Henry died, and dying left his infant son to the guardianship of the Pope, who had been, before his elevation, the great Emperor's friend and counsellor. This was, in fact, to make Victor at once Pope and Emperor; and though he enjoyed that double dignity but a short time, the example did much to prepare men's minds for what was to follow, and show the possibility of such a sovereignty as the Gregories and the Innocents afterwards almost realised.

---

[2] Baron. *Annal.*, ad An. 1000, vol. x. p. 926 D.E.

The death of Victor, the distractions of the Empire consequent upon Henry IV.'s minority and the rival claims of the House of Lorraine, exposed the See of Rome once more to the danger of becoming a prey to the avarice of the Italian nobles, and showed plainly that no permanent support could be reckoned upon from the imperial power, and that, if the Church were to be helped, she must help herself. And now appeared a line of churchmen who were not unequal to the requirements of the times. The first great move was made by Nicolas II., in one of those amazing strokes of successful audacity which only Popes can venture on, nor they except at great conjunctures. The second Lateran Council, under his inspiration, had been induced to decree that the election of the Pope should thenceforth vest in the Cardinals of Rome, wheresoever assembled, and to back that decree with one of those fearful anathemas of which mediæval Councils were alarmingly prodigal. 'May he,' they say, 'who contravenes this decree endure the wrath of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that of St. Peter and St. Paul, in this life and the next! May his house be desolate, and no one dwell in his tents! Let his children be orphans, his wife a widow, his sons outcasts and beggars! May the usurer consume his substance, and the stranger reap his labours! May all the world and all the elements war upon him, and the merits of all the saints which sleep in the Lord inflict visible vengeance on him during his life! Whosoever, on the other hand, shall keep this law, by the authority of St. Peter is absolved from all his sins.'[3]

But Nicolas knew well that such ferocious neighbours as the robber-princes of Tusculum, Præneste, and Galeria, were not to be overawed by mere threats however horrible, or mere promises however lavish of spiritual good. And, looking round for help, he spied it in a quarter where none but a Pope would have thought of seeking it. The Normans had lately descended as a swarm of impious marauders upon Italy. A

---

[3] Council held in the Lateran, 1059. See Baron. *Ann.*, vol. xi. p. 257A–261 C.D.

former Pope—Leo IX.—had levied a kind of holy war against them, had been taken prisoner, and had been given up only as a dying man. A great part of them were actually at this time under sentence of excommunication. Yet it was to these strange allies that Nicolas looked for the deliverance of the Church from the Roman barons. A bargain was soon struck. The astonished world beheld the Pope give away, as if he had been undisputed suzerain of all Naples, Capua to Duke Richard, and Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily to Robert Guiscard, and thus secure the aid of their terrible swords, not only in crushing the proud nobles by whom he was surrounded, but in maintaining his right thus to dispose of crowns at his own will and pleasure.

Nicolas was virtually succeeded by Hildebrand. I say virtually; for everyone knew that Alexander II. acted merely under the great Archdeacon's direction. With Hildebrand came the full development of the idea of the Papal theocracy; and what enabled him to realise to so great an extent that idea was the very circumstance which had before enabled Henry III. so successfully to revive the imperial supremacy, namely his standing at the head of, and being borne forward by, the reforming party in the Church. That party was indeed, then, as all reforming parties are apt to be, rushing headlong into extravagance and fanaticism; but it was a reaction from flagrant and notorious abuses, and its very extravagance and fanaticism increased for the time the force of its impulse. No doubt the moral feeling of Europe was strongly with Gregory VII. in his two grand efforts to impose celibacy upon the whole body of the priesthood, and to wrest the right of investiture from the secular princes. And in their zeal for the accomplishment of what they regarded as such holy ends as these, the reformers of that age were willingly blind to the monstrosity of his pretensions to an unheard of power of exercising an ordinary paramount sway over the princes of the earth. This, I say, was a previously unheard of power; and let not the assertion be met by bringing forward instances in which previous Popes had seemed to exercise

something like the same privileges as were claimed by Gregory VII. To argue so would be to avail oneself of the same sophistry as Hume uses in defending the pretensions of our Stuarts to arbitrary power. It may be that there is scarcely one of Charles I.'s despotic acts for which something like a precedent may not be found in some one or other previous prince's proceedings, through a long succession of monarchs during a long lapse of generations. But an instance here and there of vigour beyond the law, put forth at rare conjunctures and under peculiar circumstances, is a very different thing from converting an exception into the rule, and claiming this power beyond the law as the ordinary prerogative of the sovereign.

Where something was apparently called for by circumstances which no recognised or established civil power could do legitimately, the Bishops of Rome had sometimes come forward, in a kind of prophetic character, as the legates of heaven, to give the sanction of religion to what appeared to be the demands of necessity, to consecrate the requirements of political expediency, and make them assume the character of dispensations of Providence. Thus Pope Zachary gave the crown of France to Pepin, and Leo III. saluted Charlemagne as Cæsar Augustus. But these were in their nature extraordinary acts, to be tolerated only in the great emergencies which called them forth. To Gregory VII. was reserved the daring attempt of turning them into examples of the regular and ordinary supremacy of the Roman See.

I have noticed one cause already which made these bold pretensions popular at the time, the certainty that this enormous power would be used for the reformation of the Church, and its deliverance from flagrant abuses and from an odious secular tyranny, joined to the conviction that no less power, power in no other hands, could accomplish these ardently desired objects.

But there was another cause also, of a less spiritual character, operating in favour of the Popes during their struggle with the imperial and royal powers of Europe.

We have seen from the beginning, that the Bishops of Rome derived strength from two sources, a spiritual and a secular, partly as the Roman Church was an Apostolic See, and partly as it subsisted in the chief city of the Empire. Now in the present case we must not forget the latter of those sources. The divisions of Europe had not obliterated the traditions of the old Roman Empire. There was still the feeling that its nations constituted one state. And the fierceness and lawlessness of those divisions created an intense longing for some central arbiter by whose decision they might be controlled—something that would give the idea of right, instead of the wild and ferocious anarchy which results when 'the strongest hand uppermost' is the only principle admitted. How deeply, even apart from all religious considerations, the image of a rightful supremacy of Rome had been impressed upon the European mind, appears from many circumstances in history. The extraordinary attempt of Arnold of Brescia to restore the authority of the old Republic attests this fact; but still more, in a later age, what almost realised his visions, the extraordinary career of the tribune Rienzi, in whom for a brief space we see the portrait of a kind of secular pope, embodying the majesty, not of religion but of law, and summoning independent princes before his bar. Could this strange power have subsisted anywhere, even for a month, but in Rome? Is not the same thing attested by the mysterious kind of dignity which the title of the Holy Roman Empire gave to the States of the Germanic Confederation? Did not Napoleon I. show a keen perception of the imaginative force of this spell when he proclaimed his son King of Rome; and may not Napoleon III. have a view in the same direction in maintaining at such expense a French garrison in the Eternal City?[4]

Apart then, as I said, from all religious considerations, regarding the Pope no longer as the successor of St. Peter, but merely as the possessor of Rome, that circumstance might seem to mark him out as the fit person to hold the

---

[4] Written in December, 1851.

balance of Europe in his hand. Everything, indeed, which the nations of Europe had in common was to be traced up to Rome as its source and centre. There was the knot of all the cords which bound them together. It was Rome and Rome alone which gave unity to their religion, their jurisprudence, their literature, their language. The image and superscription of Rome, stamped upon everything they had of value, seemed to establish a claim of tribute from those who were so deeply indebted to her. And thus, both in the Church and in the State, the religious and the civil wants of Europe seemed to prepare the way for the realisation of that gigantic scheme which Gregory VII. conceived and bequeathed as an inheritance never to be forgotten, as it never has been forgotten, by his successors.[5]

---

[5] *Dictatus of Gregory VII.*

That the Roman Church was founded only by the Lord.

That the Bishop of Rome alone can be called Universal.

That he alone can depose and restore Bishops.

That his Legate, of whatever order, must have precedence of all Bishops in Councils [and can give sentence of deposition against them].

[That the Pope can depose the absent.]

That his excommunication excludes absolutely from all communion, so that we must not even dwell in the same house.

That he [by himself alone, according to the necessity of the time] can make new laws, gather fresh congregations, divide Bishoprics [create an Abbacy from a body of Canons, and the contrary, divide a wealthy Bishopric and unite poor ones].

That he [alone] is entitled to the imperial ensigns.

That all princes are bound to salute his feet [the feet of the Pope alone].

[That his name alone should be recited in churches.]

[That there is only one name in the world, viz., of the Pope.]

That he can depose Emperors.

That he can translate Bishops [need compelling]. [That he can] ordain for any part of the Church. [That one ordained by him can preside over another Church, but not serve in war, and that he ought not to receive a higher grade from any Bishop.]

That no General Council can be held without his leave [precept].

[That no Chapter, no Book, can be held to be canonical without his authority.]

[That his sentence ought to be retracted by none, and he himself alone of all can retract it.]

That he cannot be judged by anyone.

That appeals lie from all parts of the Church to him. [That none dare to condemn him that appeals to the Apostolic See.]

[That the greater causes of every Church ought to be referred to him.]

That the Roman Church never has erred and never will [by the testimony of Scripture].

[That the Roman Pontiff, if he has been canonically ordained, is by the merits of the Blessed Peter undoubtedly made holy, by the testimony of St. Ennodius, Bishop of Papia, many holy fathers agreeing with him, as is contained in the decrees of the Blessed Symmachus.]

[That by his precept and licence it is permitted to subjects to make accusations.]

[That without a Synodical Assembly he can depose and reconcile Bishops.]

That no one can be esteemed a Catholic who is not in communion with [does not agree with] the Roman Church.

That the Pope can absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance [from their allegiance to the unjust].

These 'Dictatus' of Gregory VII. were written on the blank side of one of the leaves, without any indication of the place in which they were to be introduced, or the source, no doubt authentic, from which they were derived. We have subjoined them here, with some additions and variations enclosed in brackets, from the form in which they appear in the *Annals* of Baronius, vol. xi. pp. 479–80, ad an. 1076, 4 Greg. VII.—EDITORS.

LECTURE VII.

GREGORY VII.—QUESTION OF INVESTITURE—CLERICAL CELIBACY.

Gentlemen,—I have said that in his two grand enterprises; first, of imposing the rule of celibacy on the clergy universally; and second, of wresting the right of ecclesiastical investitures from the temporal prince, Gregory VII. had the general feeling of the movement party of the Church throughout Europe in his favour.

Both of these measures, it is apparent, were absolutely necessary for the consolidation of that scheme of a Papal theocracy which was ever before his mind, and the realisation of which he prosecuted with that intense and unremitting energy of will which seems, much more than largeness of view or amplitude of intellect, to have been his title to rank in the catalogue of great men.

Both these measures, I say, were necessary for his purpose. That a mere secular prince—a profane layman—should presume to hold in his possession, nay, even to lay his polluted hands upon the sacred ring and crozier which were the badges of spiritual power, was utterly repugnant to the whole principle and spirit of his system; and he could not but know that as long as the people saw their prelates humbly receiving these insignia from the hands of the civil magistrate, the idea of that magistrate's being in some way the fountain of ecclesiastical as well as of civil jurisdiction—the fundamental idea in short of the Imperial as opposed to the Papal system—must always be associated with such a ceremony. And he was too shrewd an observer of human nature not to have learned that ideas thus associated with established rites and customs, and

conveyed through the senses in the gross forms of visible practice, are apt to take a more permanent hold of the popular mind, than anything which is merely entrusted to the more fine and abstract medium of rational teaching. Where an idea is thus embodied in a customary rite or ceremony, it will need no peculiar skill or zeal in the performer to impress it upon the beholder. He has but to go through the rite to accomplish that. And though the idea conveyed will be loose and vague, and want precision, being left to be collected from the ceremony by the rude minds of the spectators themselves, still in a loose and vague form it will be permanently impressed; and when the principles which it involves are propounded to those accustomed to the rite, those principles will be readily admitted as things before implicitly assented to as known and recognised truths. Nay, further, the very vagueness of the impression makes it capable of indefinite development. Men feel in such cases that they have been taught something by the outward forms of law or religion, of which they have but a general notion that has never been drawn out or analysed; and when a statement of it is presented to them which they can recognise as resembling that notion, though in reality going far beyond it, they readily admit it as the correct representation of their previous faith. It was clearly, therefore, incumbent upon Gregory to obliterate a rite embodying, in the eyes of the people, an idea utterly repugnant to the system he was seeking to establish.

But this was not all. The necessity of the case touched him still more closely. The possession of the ring and crozier by the temporal prince gave to the secular power practically the disposal of the dignities of the Church, and thus made it the interest of all who aspired to such dignities to keep at least on fair terms with the absolute disposers of them. The clergy were the army, the army dispersed in garrisons as it were through every state of Europe, by means of which Gregory proposed to control the sovereigns of those states, and force them to obey the edicts issued from the Roman capital. That army, therefore, must especially, and in the

first place, be exempted from all dependence upon the very persons whom they might at any time be called on to assist in controlling or deposing; that army must specially, and in the first place, be made completely dependent upon their spiritual head. The abolition of investitures manifestly subserved the former of these objects, the disruption of the ties which bound the clerical order to the state; and though it did not as manifestly subserve the other, the total subjugation of that order to the Roman See, yet it did so really, and perhaps was all the more successful in so doing by not doing it openly. It might seem, indeed, that in the struggle against investitures, the Popes were fighting, not so much their own battles as those of the Chapters, in whom canonically the right of lection inhered. But in truth when the maxims of the canone law, as modified by the Decretal forgeries, began to be understood, it was soon perceived that such elections were little better than a weapon which might be advantageously used against the Emperor, but could never be turned against the Pope. For with the Pope rested the sole judgment of the validity of an election, with him the decision by what offences the dignity might be forfeited. In no case could anyone whom the Pope disliked have any reasonable chance of obtaining or retaining a bishopric or an abbey. Some flaw in the election or some flaw in the person could always be detected by the acute eye of a canonist or a theologian to justify the Pope, who judged without appeal, in refusing to ratify the Chapter's choice, or degrading the object of it even after ratification. It was, however, the former of these ends, the independence of the spiritual upon the temporal government, for which the abolition of the investitures was primarily needful.

And the same may be said of the celibacy of the clergy. 'He who has a wife and children,' says Bacon, 'has given pledges to fortune.' It is impossible that a married clergy should not feel themselves to be citizens as well as priests. The law of nature compels them to sympathise, nay, identify themselves, with their offspring; and though in their own persons they may consider themselves as wholly belonging to

a separate and exclusive corporation, yet, in the persons of their children, they will feel all the influences of that lay society in which they are contained. For I am speaking of such an order as a Christian priesthood. It may be to a great extent otherwise in the case of such priestly castes as those of ancient Egypt or modern India, where the priesthood constitute an hereditary aristocracy, and where the interests and calling of the son are unalterably the same as the interests and calling of the father. But in a Christian state the case is different. The sons of the clergy are mere laymen until they choose to dedicate themselves to the ministry. The daughters of the clergy are free to ally themselves with men of any rank or profession. And hence, wherever a married clergy subsists in a Christian state, that clergy are brought through their families under the operation of those same social influences as act upon the great body of the laity. The clerical order is as it were held in suspension by the surrounding mass, and kept from crystallising into that hard compact body which it forms under other circumstances. Now such a hard compact body was just the thing which Gregory needed as the foundation of the edifice he was erecting. He could not afford that any one particle of social interest and affection should be drawn away from the corporate succession of the clerical order itself, and wasted upon such mere secular relationships as those of sons and daughters. The Church—meaning thereby the great clerical hierarchy in close dependence on and strict subordination to himself as its head—this was the object which was to engross and exhaust all the powers of love and zeal and earnest devotion implanted in human nature, and, as far as possible, not a wish or thought was to stray from it to any other object. That the clergy—even monks—should have fathers and mothers, and brothers and sisters, was an evil which could not be remedied. He would doubtless have preferred a race of men cast in iron or cut out of a quarry, if they could have been got. But ancestral connections with the laity were unavoidable. All that could be done in that respect was to inculcate the necessity of disowning and neglecting them. What could

be guarded against was the unnecessary multiplication of such connections by marriage; and against that, therefore, he set himself to guard with an unrelenting vigour which characterised all his proceedings.

These two measures, then, the abolition of investitures and the enforcement of the celibacy of the clergy, were, as I said, requisite for realising such a theocratic scheme as Gregory had conceived. But whatever may be said of himself, it was not their fitness for realising that scheme which enlisted the public feeling of Europe in their favour. It was rather the connection of that scheme with them which gave it favour in men's eyes. Public feeling was running strongly against investitures and the marriage of the clergy, as the supposed means and symptoms of the secularisation and degradation of the clergy.

It was not merely the peculiar form—the delivery of the ring and crozier—which investiture had assumed since the time of Otho the Great, that was repugnant to the feelings of churchmen; but the whole notion of lay patronage had become odious from the scandalous manner in which that patronage had been administered. Simony had become the crying sin of the Church. The fierce and unscrupulous temporal princes of that age set up bishoprics and abbeys to the highest bidder. Priests as profligate, and even still more unscrupulous, became purchasers of such spiritual dignities, as a means of worldly splendour and of providing for their families. The goods of the Church which they had purchased themselves, they resold to others, or alienated as a provision for their children. And here we see one clear link of connection between simony and concubinage, which are always joined together in the canons of those times, and appear to have been indissolubly associated in the thoughts of men. It was supposed that the marriage of priests was the great temptation to simony in all its forms, both the purchase of ecclesiastical dignities and the sale or alienation of them afterwards; it was thought that the goods of the Church, which were intended for the relief of the poor, the encouragement of learning, the diffusion of

piety, would necessarily be diverted to secular purposes if their owners were permitted to marry and have families, and that in cutting off that licence the rulers of the Church would cut off the sin of simony by the roots.

But besides this direct connection of the idea of simony with that of marriage, there was another, less obvious indeed, but not really perhaps less close.

The marriage of the clergy was everywhere more or less against the general feeling of Christendom. We have traced in former lectures the rise and progress of the ascetic spirit in the Church. We have endeavoured to point out its source in human nature, and to explain how a violent reaction from the immorality of paganism quickened its growth in the Christian Church. We showed how, gradually, as the superior excellence of celibacy was more and more magnified, the married life was more and more despised, and those who lived in that state were looked down upon, first as an inferior class, and then as almost a polluted one. We pointed out that the necessary effect of all this upon the position of the clergy was to force them forward with the prevailing movement. Men by their profession specially dedicated to the service of heaven, men consecrated to the most solemn acts of religion, men upon whom the eyes of their brethren were always turned, could not without obloquy place themselves openly in the ranks of the weak and the imperfect. There was manifest danger that by so doing their entire influence would be lost. Yielding to such a pressure, the clergy did very generally throw themselves into the ascetic movement; and already, as we have seen, in the fourth century an attempt was made in the very first General Council to impose celibacy, as a compulsory thing, upon the whole order. And though such a compulsory law was warded off for a time by the courage of the Confessor Paphnutius,[1] yet the law of public

---

[1] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 11, tells us that when the Bishops at the Nicene Council proposed to enjoin that bishops, priests, and deacons should no longer cohabit with the wives they had married while yet laymen, Paphnutius, who had lost an eye in the persecution, 'rose, and with loud voice cried out not to lay a heavy yoke on consecrated men; that the

opinion became nevertheless every day more and more stringent. And, indeed, if we look into the Decretum of Gratian, we shall find that some of the strongest expressions which occur there against the marriage of priests are taken from genuine writings of Jerome and Augustine.

It must force itself, I think, upon the mind of anyone who impartially and carefully considers the writings of these two Fathers, who, be it remembered, were pre-eminently the moulders of theological opinion in the West, that a notion, essentially Manichean, of a pollution attached to marriage was strongly imprinted on their own minds, and strongly transferred to the minds of others. As to what was or was not strictly canonical or uncanonical, that varied with particular times and places; but it cannot, I think, be denied that from the fifth century, at any rate, the general feeling of the Church was strongly in favour of clerical celibacy, and that a married priest was looked down upon at least as hardly respectable, and in some cases execrated as a horrible criminal. The existence of this popular feeling is sometimes, indeed, distinctly put forward as a ground of legislation in accordance with it, by those who did not themselves share in the vulgar prejudice. 'It hath come to our knowledge,' says the Quinisext Council in its 12th Canon, 'that in Africa and Libya and other places, the godly presidents of those Churches have occasioned scandal and offence to the laity by refusing to renounce the company of their own wives even after their consecration of orders. Being, therefore, most earnest to

---

marriage bed is honourable, and marriage itself undefiled; not by excessive strictness to injure the Church still more; that all cannot bear such passionless asceticism, nor the chastity of the wives be preserved alike in all cases; that the union with a lawful wife was always chastity; that it was enough that he who had already become a clergyman should not afterwards marry, according to the ancient tradition of the Church, not that he should be separated from the wife he had once for all already taken when a layman; and this he said being himself without experience of marriage, or, in a word, without knowledge of a woman, having been brought up from a child in a monastery, and celebrated by all for his continence. The entire assembly of the consecrated men is persuaded by the words of Paphnutius. The further discussion is passed over in silence, and the matter left to the discretion of each.'—EDITORS.

benefit the flocks submitted to our care, we have determined that this practice shall from henceforth cease. And this we say, not as meaning to subvert or overturn the previous constitutions of the Apostles, but from a prudent care for the salvation and advancement of the lay-people, and to cut off occasion of reproach and ridicule of the sacred order.' In the East a sort of compromise was effected, and perhaps with the more ease out of antagonism to the rigour of the Roman See. Quini-sext [Can. xiii.]:—

'Though we know,' says the Council, 'that it is part of the Roman rule that those who are ordained deacons or priests should renounce intercourse with their wives, we, following the ancient Apostolic canon and the institution of holy men, confirm lawful marriages made before orders, and do not require that he who is to be ordained subdeacon, deacon, or priest, should separate from his wife.'

The effect of this decree was to allow to the clergy of all ranks under the episcopal, the enjoyment of a married life, provided they had married before taking orders; while it forbad a second marriage after orders, and excluded also from its privilege those who aspired to the higher dignities of the hierarchy.

The result of such an arrangement on the character of the Greek clergy has been well pointed out by Burke in his admirable letter on the Penal Laws.

'There is a great resemblance,' says he, 'between the whole frame and constitution of the Greek and Latin Churches. The secular clergy in the former, by being married, living under little restraint, and having no particular education suited to their function, are universally fallen into such contempt that they are never permitted to aspire to the dignities of their own Church. It is not considered respectful to call them *papas*, their true and ancient appellation; but those who wish to address them with civility always call them *hieromonachi*. In consequence of this disrespect, which, I venture to say, in such a Church must be the consequence of a secular life, a very great degeneracy from reputable Christian manners

has taken place throughout almost the whole of that great member of the Christian Church.'

These remarks are made with the author's usual deep insight into human nature; and if we consider them attentively they will help to show how a really earnest reforming party, at the age we speak of, should have been contending earnestly for the universal enforcement, as a remedy for immorality, of that rule of clerical celibacy which reason and experience unite to prove a cause itself of the grossest immorality. The idea of forcing absolute celibacy upon men who, too often, could not live decorously even as married men, may at first strike one as absurdly monstrous, but the truth is that it is the instinct of self-preservation which compels the Roman Church to make this stern requirement from its clergy. Whether or not a married clergy can be safely permitted in a Church must depend in a great measure upon the principles of that Church; and it is rash in the extreme to argue from the case of a Church in which marriage is regarded with favour to that of one in which it is looked down upon as a sort of degradation. Now, that some degradation was regarded as involved in the married state of the clergy generally throughout Christendom is plain from many circumstances—first from the recognised principles of theology. The writings of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries may not have been very extensively known and studied, but still they would have been almost universally recognised as standards of theological orthodoxy; and with respect to their opinions they leave us, as I said, themselves in no doubt.

In the next place, they tell us not only their own opinions, but the practice of the Church in their time. And we clearly gather from their testimony that, while within certain limits a married life among the clergy was tolerated in some places, it was hardly more than tolerated by the dominant party anywhere, and in some absolutely forbidden.

Next come decrees of Provincial Synods, as the famous Council of Elvira (almost contemporary with that of Nice), the

Second Council of Carthage, the Second of Tours, and that of Auxerre, absolutely forbidding it.[2]

Next is the circumstance that, even when tolerated, it was tolerated only within certain limits. Scarcely anywhere is the marriage of a priest actually in orders at the time recognised by any Council or any writer of approved character for orthodoxy. Everyone seems to shrink from such a thought with ineffable horror, even while permitting those who had married as laymen to retain their wives. This is the weak point in the case of the Greek Church. It is a manifest concession of some incompatibility between holy orders and

---

[2] *Concil. Elib.* c. 33. 'Placuit in totum prohibere episcopis, presbyteris et diaconibus vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio abstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios: quicunque vero fecerit ab honore clericatûs exterminetur.' This decree, it is observable, while forbidding sexual intercourse between husband and wife in the case of any ordained persons, does not require the dissolution of the marriage or the separation of the parties. On the contrary, it is plain that the Council contemplated their continuing to live together, since we find afterwards the following canon, 65: 'If the wife of a clergyman commit adultery, and the husband be aware of it, and does not immediately cast her off, let him never be readmitted to communion.' And similarly, the Second Council of Tours, c. 12: 'Let a Bishop have his wife as his sister, and govern the household, both his ecclesiastics and his own family, with such a holy conversation as that no suspicion of him may in any way arise.' And then it goes on to provide for the case of an unmarried Bishop, c. 13: 'Episcopum *Episcopam* non habentem, nulla sequatur turba mulierum.' This is the arrangement for the Bishop; the legislation for the inferior clergy is still more curious. Careful arrangements are made to prevent man and wife from sleeping together, but no idea is entertained of breaking the marriage, or separating the parties in other respects. It is acknowledged that there is a general suspicion on the part of the laity that the majority of the married clergy do allow themselves conjugal intercourse with their wives; but the Council speaks of such a suspicion as most horrible and injurious, and denounces a year's excommunication 'Si inventus fuerit presbyter cum suâ presbyterâ, aut diaconus cum suâ diaconissâ, aut subdiaconus cum sua subdiaconissâ.' And by an ingenious misrepresentation they make the heresy of the Nicolaitans consist in teaching that the deacons might have conjugal intercourse with their own wives. This, they observe, was the utmost that anyone, however licentious, ventured to teach in the good old times; it is a mark that these are the last and the worst age of the Church, that now even priests should venture on such enormous profligacy! And so the Council of Auxerre, c. 21: 'Non licet presbytero post acceptam benedictionem in uno lecto cum presbyterâ suâ dormire.'—AUTHOR.

matrimony; and there is no doubt that here, as elsewhere, the Western is more consistent in its vigorous logic than the Eastern Church.

And lastly, in most cases the conduct of the married clergy themselves made it evident that they felt they were acting inconsistently with the feeling of the Church. Their wives did not venture upon assuming the full position of a wife. They were commonly called concubines or mistresses. I say this was the general rule, though doubtless there were exceptions. One remarkable exception was the Church of Milan, which, relying on the tradition of St. Ambrose, as they alleged, adhered to the same rule as the Greek Church; while the clergy of Lombardy generally, if I understand the accounts given aright, seem to have married openly while in orders, with all the customary solemnities—the ring, the benediction, the legal deed of dower and settlement.

But notwithstanding these, and perhaps some other exceptions, the evidence I think seems full and complete that the marriage of priests, though tolerated, was an anomaly not easily reconcilable with the prevailing theology of the Church, and that its extensive toleration was the result, not of enlightened views of the true nature of morality, but of a worldly and secular spirit; that a priest's marrying in those times was the result of the same indifference about the higher duties of his calling as a priest's now addicting himself to farming, or to the collecting of rents, or to trade. It was a voluntary lowering himself by doing what was generally regarded as more or less inconsistent with his sacred functions, and what it is plain the most stirring party and popular party in the Church regarded with horror. For now the ascetic monastic feeling, roused by reaction from the horrible licentiousness in which the tenth century had closed, was springing into wonderful activity. The tone of the leaders of that party need not be learned only from Hildebrand. It is, if possible, still more fierce in the voice of Peter Damian; and I suppose that no one who has not studied that eminent writer's works can have the least conception of the resources of the

vocabulary of ecclesiastical Billingsgate. The unhappy wives of the clergy in particular are overwhelmed with a torrent of abuse, and, women though they were, I hardly think they could have kept the field of wordy combat with such a scolder. Pulpamenta diaboli, virus mentium, aconita bibentium, gynæcæa Hostis antiqui, upupæ, ululæ, lupæ, sanguisugæ, scorta, prostibula, volutabra porcorum pinguium, cubilia spirituum immundorum, nymphæ, Sirenæ, lamiæ, Dianae—these are but a small specimen of the choice epithets which this holy man flings around him with lavish prodigality.[3] Indeed, to be a good scolder and curser seems to be one of the chief requisites in a mediæval saint; nor do I remember any instance of an eminent Doctor of the Church who seems to have thought that any restraint upon his tongue was at all needful, or indeed tolerable, when heresy, or schism, or refractoriness to ecclesiastical discipline were to be spoken of. In all such cases their mouths were full of cursing and bitterness, and I must add that their feet were swift to shed blood. For from this time forth, fire and sword became the regular instrument of ecclesiastical government; and the Chief Pastor of Western Christendom seemed to find his principal occupation in stirring up the most unnatural and most devastating wars over the whole continent of Europe.

It is sad to observe such consequences of a zeal in many respects sincere for a religious reformation. But without a change in the principles of the Church, it is hard to see how such results could be avoided; and one of the chief uses of Ecclesiastical history is, I think, to trace the working out of the consequences of those false principles with which the Church was very early poisoned. Before experience had made known those consequences—before, for example, the practical results of the Papal monarchy, or of the enforced celibacy of the clergy had been disclosed—those who had recourse to these, as

---

[3] See the curious history of his 'Gomorrhæus' in Baron. *Annal.* vol. xi. pp. 162E, 164 B.C. A specimen of his style of abuse may be found in his letter to Pope Nicolas II., p. 263E. The language of this letter is too gross to be copied.—EDITORS.

remedies for flagrant abuses existing before their eyes, may to some extent be excused. But to revert now to an experiment which has been fully tried for centuries together, and which has not only failed but failed so deplorably, embittering and increasing all the evils it sought to remedy, besides importing new ones, appears to me the extreme of folly. But I suppose the human race would be too wise and too happy if they could only learn to profit by the disasters of their forefathers, without being forced, from time to time, to experience them again and again.

LECTURE VIII.

RETROSPECT OF THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE PAPACY.

Gentlemen,—We have arrived at a point in our historical deduction at which it will be convenient to pause and take a brief retrospect of the ground that we have traversed.

My object in the present course of lectures was to give you a just conception of the great development of the Papal supremacy in the Western Church. I endeavoured from the first to point out to you that that supremacy sprang from the conception of Christendom as one grand theocratic state forming one perfectly organised visible society. Such a state for its permanent government seemed to require a permanent visible head, the Vicar and representative of the Son of God; and practically the two rival claimants of this high office were the Emperor and [the Pope.

And here][1] we hail with pleasure Dean Milman's reappear-

---

[1] The foregoing Introduction was found with the MSS. of the Lectures, but without anything that we could treat as the sequel. In the *Irish Church Journal*, however, at the dates of August, September, and October, 1854, we found a review of Milman's *Latin Christianity*, in three parts. The second of these contained a long passage which was missing in the first Lecture of the second series, and identified by some remaining portions of the Bishop's MS. of that Lecture. This we have transferred to its proper place. The third part was a discussion of Macaulay's question, why no people who did not embrace the Reformation at first, subsequently adopted it? This discussion was identical with a portion of the first Lecture of the Reformation series, written and delivered in 1853, and appearing then in its original place. We have no doubt, therefore, that this portion of the review was read as the sequel to the foregoing Introduction, whether with or without the parts derived from other Lectures. We therefore print here the parts not given in them, only repeating one small passage marked with inverted commas to maintain the connection. The proper place for this Lecture seems to be where we have now placed it. It surveys, as the Introduction indicates, the

ance as an ecclesiastical historian,[2] and the more so because the region over which he now guides his readers is not one presenting the same occasions of offence as met us in his former historical pieces. However Romanists or semi-Romanists may shudder at his treatment of the legends of Pope Gregory in the present work, few Protestants will complain of it as unreasonably sceptical. Still, at times, even here there occur passages that sound oddly when coming from an Anglican divine, and which it is hard to vindicate from the charge of culpable latitudinarianism; and when he extends the term 'Christian' so far as to designate those with whom 'Christianity melts into a high moral theism,' he seems to us to err as much against philosophical precision of language as against theological propriety. To embrace under the common term of 'Christians' all who may choose to take that title to themselves is, in fact, to make it a purely arbitrary designation, representing no ideas of any moral importance whatever. A history of Christianity, under this view of it, can have no place. There will be no one thing, except the very name, common to those whom such extreme liberality admits within the pale of the Christian community. A history of Christians might indeed still be written; but it would have as little philosophic unity in its conception as a history of the men who have been called John, or by any other capriciously given appellation. Christians, however, of this large description belong, according to Dean Milman's view, to the type of Teutonic Christianity, with which we have no immediate concern just now. It is to the rise and progress of that peculiar form which he calls Latin Christianity that the volumes now before us are dedicated. The work opens with a striking delineation of the contrasted features of the Greek and Latin types of Christianity.

The Greek type, in Dean Milman's view, is characterised by an insatiable inquisitiveness and a tendency to abstruse

---

development of the Papal supremacy,before the rise of monasticism is discussed.—EDITORS.

[2] *History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V.*

and endless speculation, but feeble in practical results or creative power, the forces of which, he thinks, had been exhausted before the extinction of paganism in the East, so that its progress in the way of diffusion was soon arrested. Its development was almost wholly confined to decisions of difficult questions in speculative theology, and even this intellectual activity, for which alone it was fitted, soon ceased, as barbarism made inroads upon an outworn civilisation, which the Eastern Church had not sufficient energies to renew. Latin Christianity, on the contrary, was, he thinks, essentially creative, practical in its whole character, and assuming from the first the position rather of a judge and arbiter in religious controversies than a disputant.

> Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento:
> Hæ tibi erunt artes.

'It was the Roman Empire again extended over Europe by an universal code and a provincial government, by an hierarchy of religious prætors or proconsuls, and a host of inferior officers, each in strict subordination to those immediately above them, and gradually descending to the very lowest ranks of society, the whole with a certain degree of freedom of action, but a constrained and limited freedom, and with an appeal to the Spiritual Cæsar in the last resort.'

This perpetuation of the Roman Empire in the hierarchy of the Latin Church seems to have struck almost every close observer of that wonderful system. It struck the old philosopher of Malmesbury two centuries ago as forcibly as it has struck the Dean of St. Paul's; and the latter's words, just quoted, will probably remind the reader of the remarkable passage in which Hobbes describes the Papacy as 'the ghost of the old Roman Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.'

The absolute supremacy of the Pope is indeed the keystone of the fabric of Latin Christianity; and it is not surprising, therefore, that the history of that development, following the nature of the development itself, finds its unity in the rise and

progress of the Papal power. From a very early period the Bishops of the great Sees appear to have started in a race for pre-eminence; and the result of their efforts, each to extend and enlarge his own privileges, gave existence to what were afterwards called the patriarchates. Now in this race the Bishop of Rome had a manifest advantage over his brethren. Down to the time of Constantine, Rome was the imperial city, the one acknowledged centre of all the secular affairs of the civilised world, and therefore the most convenient of its ecclesiastical concerns also. But besides this pre-eminence in respect of the whole Empire, it had a special position in respect of the Western portion of it. Here it stood not only as the chief in precedence, but absolutely alone and unrivalled in the dignity of its spiritual traditions. If Antioch, and Alexandria, and Ephesus, and Jerusalem were obliged to own the superiority of the city of Rome, still in respect of Apostolic foundation, those ancient Sees stood at least on a level with the Roman Church.

But throughout the West, Rome was, from the second century at least, looked up to as not only the natural centre, from its civil position, of the great ecclesiastical confraternity, but as the inheritor and representative of the tradition of Peter and Paul, who were supposed to have instructed and ordained its first Bishops, and entrusted to the succession of its Prelates the custody of their teaching. The appeal to the tradition of Apostolic Churches, as the historic testimony of the Apostles' immediate followers, was a most natural and allowable topic with the early Christian teachers in their disputes with heretics, especially with those who sought to control the evidence of Scripture by pretending a secret esoteric tradition from the same source. But soon a step was made in advance. The appeal began to assume a different character. The voice of the Apostolic Church began to speak in the tone rather of authority than of testimony, as if the Apostolic founder still, in some mysterious way, subsisted in the line of his successors and spoke through their lips. From this point of view, the glowing imagination of Cyprian seems

first to have invested the Roman Episcopate with a character which ultimately enabled them to rule absolutely the whole Western Church. Peter, according to Cyprian, was the symbol of Apostolic unity; and what Peter was among the Apostles, that is the succession of Bishops which he founded among the whole Episcopate. The extent of the privilege which Cyprian did mean by this obscure dogma to concede to Rome is not at all clear. That he did not mean to concede the absolute supremacy which was afterwards founded upon it is abundantly manifest from his bold assertion of his own independence, and his uncompromising resistance to the Roman Bishop in the matter of the baptizing heretics. Still the seed was sown; the seed of Roman supremacy sown by a Carthaginian hand; and though it did not immediately germinate, it was not dead.

Meanwhile, however, as Rome was thus working her roots deeper and deeper into the soil of ecclesiastical associations, a rival See sprang up under the influence of mere secular arrangements—that of Constantinople. But while the transference of the Imperial Court, and that court for the first time a Christian one, to the new capital, raised of a sudden the hitherto obscure Bishop of Byzantium into the very first rank of the prelates of the Church, it did less than a hasty observer might suppose to impair the power of the Bishop of old Rome.

The conversion of the Emperors to Christianity gave them a position in the Church which, if they had remained in Rome, might have effectually eclipsed the lustre of the Papacy. That tendency to transfer to Christianity the ideas of the elder dispensation which had previously made the Christian ministry assume the guise of a Levitical priesthood, led men at once to recognise in the Emperor the vicegerent of the Almighty in a new theocratic state, the kingdoms of this world visibly become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ. The immediate presence at Constantinople of such a power as this, uniting to a great extent a spiritual and a temporal supremacy in one person, and invested with the

glories of both worlds, the earthly and the heavenly, threw back the patriarch of that city into a situation of comparative obscurity. Greek Christianity developed itself under an imperial head, and derived from that circumstance much of the feebleness and corruption which rendered it the less vigorous development of sacerdotalism. Its natural tendencies are now again showing themselves in an endeavour to reunite its paralysed body once more to such a head in the person of the Russian Czar, exalted into the representative of the Eastern Cæsars. But when Rome became Christian, the Pope reaped all the benefits of the change, as Prelate of the first capital of a Christian Empire, without having his splendour eclipsed by the nearness of the great secular luminary of that Empire. Nay, more, the absence of the Emperor from a spot to which men's eyes had so long been accustomed to turn as the seat of empire, must have done something to prepare the way for the temporal power of the Bishops of that ancient seat of empire. More and more every day, it seemed as if circumstances compelled the Bishop of Rome to come forward as the magistrate and the statesman; and more and more every day, it was becoming clear that he was destined to fill the throne which had been left vacant for him upon the seven hills. Thus, as Bishop of a capital city, the Pope had at least a co-ordinate dignity with his brother of Constantinople in the whole Empire, and he had that dignity, so far as the West was concerned, without a present superior and without a rival. The Patriarch of Constantinople, on the contrary, was not only overshadowed by the Imperial Court, but had to struggle for the upstart privileges of his See with spiritual dignitaries much older than himself. He was the youngest, and yet claiming to be the greatest, of a number of spiritual Paladins, each of whom sought for the pre-eminence, which Imperial caprice had given to him, upon more venerable grounds than he could assign. Constantinople could not maintain itself on any plea which Rome had not in common with it; while Rome also took spiritual rank with the Apostolic Churches

of Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, and Jerusalem, the Bishops of which were proudly impatient of the sway which the Patriarch of the new capital sought to establish over them. These struggles for pre-eminence gave peculiar bitterness and rancour to the theological disputes by which the East was nearly torn asunder during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, and which contributed in no slight degree to exalt the dignity of the great Patriarch of the West. Throughout these disputes, as Dean Milman justly observes, the Popes 'held the balance of power,' and each party sought to make the Bishop of Rome his ally in the quarrel. Standing at the head of the compact and comparatively undisturbed body of the Western Churches, he possessed a weight which could at any time turn that balance, and thus the divisions of the East enabled him often apparently to govern the whole of Christendom. The development of Latin Christianity, however, essentially involved in it a separation between the East and West. It was essential to that development that the Churches comprising its body should form as it were a single people, of one ecclesiastical language, and cast in one mould of theology.

Such a language was supplied to the West by the Vulgate of Jerome, and such a theology by the works of Augustine. But long ere that, the mind of the Eastern Churches had been formed by other masters, and learned to speak a different tongue. Between Constantinople and Rome there was a great gulf fixed, which prevented either from falling under the dominion of the other. Their longer union could but encumber and embarrass the separate developments which were going on in each—one round the Pope, the other round the Emperor. And while each of these developments claims to be exclusively the Catholic system, the truth is that both are radically and essentially uncatholic, and incapable of definite existence otherwise than as the religions of parts of the human family. The same eternal laws as make an universal empire impossible, and break up the human race into separate kingdoms, will always prevent the universal extension of any such peculiar

types of ecclesiastical character over all Christendom as either of these systems requires in its integrity. Latin Christianity is so far from being catholic that it is, from being essentially Latin, essentially uncatholic.[3]

. . . .

'The almost synchronous events of the removal of the Apostles, and the disruption of the Jewish polity, seem to have been so arranged by Providence that the latter, to some extent, compensated for the former. And just at the time when the Judaising tendency of the Church at Jerusalem was likely to do most mischief, the Roman arms drove it from its metropolis and violently broke up the associations of local dignity to which it owed its influence.' Yet, undeterred by this significant providential warning, the perversity of man, some centuries later, erected a new centre, and attempted to bind the whole Christian community to dependence on Rome.

This attempt, as Dean Milman has very well pointed out, has never been successful, except within assignable limits of time and space. The surprising success of the Roman Church from the fourth to the fifteenth century resulted, as he remarks, from this: that during that period the Popes were, for the most part, borne on by the movement which was on the swell in Europe; they were carried as it were on the shoulders of the great men who ruled the mind of Western Christendom—Athanasius, Augustine, Gregory; the founders of the Western monasticism—Benedict, Bernard, Francis, Dominic. But such a movement could not always continue with a central Church claiming absolute infallibility. The decisions which such an authority is led to make under the influence of one age become a dead weight around her neck in another, when a new generation has sprung up. And from this weight she cannot free herself without abdicating the

---

[3] Here should follow the passage from the first Lecture of the second series on the use of the word *catholic*. As it belonged to a different series there was nothing unusual in the repetition, for no doubt the Lectures themselves were repeated to different classes. As the reader can easily find the passage it is unnecessary to reprint it here. We only give the last paragraph for the sake of the connection with the sequel.

dignity she has claimed. In the sixteenth century a point was reached when the provinces and the capital of the Western Church were no longer in harmony, when Rome had fallen behind and Germany had got before the spirit of the age; and the issue was that grand disruption of the ecclesiastical system of Europe which took place at the Reformation. From that day the growth of the Latin Church has been checked. Whatever Rome has gained since then she has gained by reactions from some wild excesses of the spirit of liberty; and these reactions are manifestly in their nature temporary. They are abortive attempts to restore states of thought and feeling which belong to past stages of civilisation. They are symptoms which betray the impossibility of the co-existence, the permanent co-existence, of Latin Christianity with the progress of the human race, and disclose the fact every day more plainly, that Romanism is the product of a mediæval soil, and cannot flourish vigorously when transplanted from it.

LECTURE IX.

ON THE USE OF FANATICISM IN THE CHURCH OF ROME—CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE SECULAR AND THE REGULAR CLERGY.

GENTLEMEN,—The wonderful facility which the Roman Catholic system exhibits of turning to its own account so many varieties of temperament and character, has often been remarked by philosophical observers. It may be compared in this respect to a skilfully contrived engine, which consumes, and turns into fresh nutriment of its force, what in others either disturbs the action of the machine or is unprofitably discharged through the safety-valve or the waste-pipe. You will probably remember the striking way in which Mr. Macaulay, elaborating, as his manner is, the hints supplied by others, presents this observation in his review of Ranke's 'History of the Popes.'[1] But even those who remember that remarkable passage best will not be displeased to hear it again, and those of them who do not remember it will, I am sure, thank me for bringing it under their notice.

'The Church of Rome,' he says, 'thoroughly understands what no other Church has ever understood—how to deal with enthusiasts. In some sects, particularly in infant sects, enthusiasm is suffered to be rampant. In other sects, particularly in sects long established and richly endowed, it is regarded with aversion. The Roman Catholic Church neither submits to enthusiasm nor proscribes it, but uses it; she considers it as a great moving force, which in itself, like the muscular power of a fine horse, is neither good nor evil, but which may be so directed as to produce great good or great

---

[1] See his *Critical and Historical Essays.*

evil—and she assumes the direction to herself. It would be absurd to run down a horse like a wolf; it would be still more absurd to let him run wild, breaking fences and trampling down passengers; the rational course is to subjugate his will without impairing his vigour, to teach him to obey the rein, and then to urge him to full speed; when once he knows his master he is valuable in proportion to his strength and spirit. Just such has been the system of the Church of Rome with regard to enthusiasts; she knows that when religious feelings have obtained the complete empire of the mind they impart a strange energy; that they raise men above the dominion of pain and pleasure, that obloquy becomes glory, that death itself is contemplated only as the beginning of a higher and happier life; she knows that a person in this state is no object of contempt. He may be vulgar, ignorant, visionary, extravagant, but he will do and suffer things which it is for her interest that somebody should do and suffer, yet from which calm and sober-minded men would shrink. She accordingly enlists them in her service, assigns to them some forlorn hope in which intrepidity and impetuosity are more wanted than judgment and self-command, and sends him forth with her benediction and her applause.

'In England it not unfrequently happens that a tinker or a coal-heaver hears a sermon, or falls in with a tract which alarms him about the state of his soul; if he be a man with excitable nerves and strong imagination, he thinks himself given over to the evil power; he doubts whether he has not committed the unpardonable sin; he imputes every wild fancy that springs up in his mind to the whisper of a fiend; his sleep is broken by dreams of the Great Judgment seat, the open books, and the unquenchable fire. If, in order to escape from these burning thoughts, he flies to amusements or to licentious indulgence, the delusive release only makes his misery darker and more hopeless. At length a turn takes place; he is reconciled to his offended Maker. To borrow the fine imagery of one who had himself been thus tried, he emerges from the valley of the shadow of death, from the dark land of

gins and snares, of quagmires and precipices, of evil spirits and ravenous beasts. The sunshine is on his path; he ascends the Delectable Mountains, and catches from their summit a distant view of the shining city which is the end of his pilgrimage. Then arises in his mind,' &c.

There is, as it appears to me, an occasional exaggeration of statement, and a more than occasional, a pervading, confusion of some quite distinct ideas, throughout the very lively passage of which I have just quoted a part; but on the whole it cannot be denied that there is a great deal of truth in it. And if the question to be dealt with were a question of policy, there might appear much reason for admiring the wisdom of the Church of Rome, though less, I apprehend, upon reflection than at first sight, for there is one important consideration which the reviewer has either forgotten or deliberately kept out of sight. It is one which ought not to be neglected by anyone desirous of forming a correct estimate of this matter, considered even merely as a question of far-sighted policy.

Those Protestant sects which refuse the assistance of fanaticism do indeed, as Mr. Macaulay truly states, lose much energetic force which might be exerted in their service; but then, on the other hand, they free themselves—and of this he takes no notice—from all responsibility for that mass of extravagance and absurdity which monasticism has bound upon the system of the Church of Rome. It is not only, as Mr. Macaulay seems to imply, in Protestant sects that enthusiasm ferments into madness not untinctured with craft. The lives of Antony of Padua, of Francis of Assisi, of Bridget of Sweden, of Catharine of Sienna, are a sufficient proof that the same disease runs the same course under medical treatment in the Roman hospital, as when cast out and neglected in the Protestant ditch. Enthusiasm is not, and cannot be, so completely mastered and directed by any system, as the reviewer represents it to be by the Romish. If the Church makes up her mind to send the daring enthusiast with her benediction

and applause upon some of her forlorn hopes, she must make up her mind also to give her benediction and applause to many things which rational minds will regard with indignation and disgust. If, as we are told, the hearts of thousands, estranged from the Roman Church by the selfishness, sloth, and cowardice of her beneficed clergy, have been brought back by the zeal of the begging friars; is it not certain also that the consecration of the ravings of insanity and the transports of a ferocious fanaticism which such a policy rendered necessary, has repelled thousands from that Church, and made them feel that her system, however otherwise politic, cannot be true?

If indeed there were, as the reviewer seems almost to imply, no medium between a hairbrained enthusiasm on one side, and an indolent scepticism, or half-scepticism on the other, it might be said that while the Church gained a good deal, it lost comparatively little by making a compromise with the absurdities of fanaticism. But, rightly or wrongly, 'the Protestant sects,' as this writer is pleased to call our Churches, are fully persuaded that there is; they believe that the Christian religion, as propounded in the Bible, is true; that it is possible to obtain a rational conviction of its truth, and that a faith working by love, resulting from such a rational conviction, is quite sufficient to do all the good that is here ascribed to enthusiasm—'to raise men above the dominion of pain and pleasure, make obloquy become glory, and death itself be contemplated only as the beginning of a higher and a happier life.' Now, if the Christian religion in its purity be thus true and capable of vindicating its truth to the minds of reasonable men, it seems doubtful policy, looking at the matter as a mere question of expediency, to suffer that truth to be corrupted and disfigured for the sake of securing the services of those in whom an earthly flame supplies the place of that which should have been kindled at God's altar. Suppose that a statue of Johanna Southcote occupied in St. Paul's the place which that of St. Theresa does in St. Peter's—

let us reckon the loss on such a proceeding as well as the gain. It is true that many a rude follower of that crazy woman might by such condescension be retained in the ranks of the Established Church, and it is probable that many a one, perhaps the reviewer himself, when he sauntered in to admire the architecture or hear the music, might contemplate the image with no worse feeling than that of half-contemptuous approbation, might think no worse of the honesty, and a great deal better of the wisdom of our Protestant sect than he does at present. But are there not others, and those minds infinitely more valuable than either the ignorant fanatics or the Epicurean dilettanti we have mentioned, on whom the consecration of a Johanna or a Theresa would produce very different effects? Would not every sincere lover of truth shrink with horror and disgust from our system as a fraudulent imposture of man's devising, which courted the favour of the populace by canonising absurdity, and sanctioning the dreams of delirium? And would not the loss of such minds be, in the long run, an incalculably greater loss than any damage we incur by sternly refusing to take our saints from Bedlam, or our preachers from the cobbler's stall?

Thus, I think, we might fairly argue the question, merely on the ground of policy. But the Protestant sects imagine that they have much higher ground to stand on. Their object is, not to increase and strengthen their own influence in every way that may seem adapted to such a purpose, but to maintain the truth, and bear testimony to that and that alone. They therefore reserve their 'benediction and applause' for those whom they can trust as ministers of such a service; and, indeed, except in reference to some such aim, it does not seem clear how there is any place at all for Protestantism as distinguished from Romanism. It is by such condescensions to corrupt human nature as the reviewer admires, that the Romish communion has become what it is. It is by adopting the extravagances of the superstitious and fanatical, in order to retain the superstitious and fanatical, and make men work as her instruments, that the Church of

Rome has assumed the shape in which we at present find her:—

> Sic fortis Etruria crevit
> Scilicet, et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma.

And for the Protestant sects to copy her example would be for the Protestant sects to renounce their distinctive character, which is the maintenance of a severely true religion which will bear the scrutiny of external examination, and become self-condemned in their separation from Rome. We must, in short, if we would not destroy ourselves, renounce the use of those powerful instruments by means of which false religions can work upon mankind. We cannot combine the advantages of truth and error, of reason and of enthusiasm, of pure religion and of superstition, of reasonable faith and of blind credulity. We cannot serve Jehovah and the gods of the nations, the Lord and Baal, God and Mammon. We have made our election; we are satisfied that the Lord He is God, and we have resolved to follow Him, and we trust that His power will supply the place of what is gained for others by the tricks of earthly policy. The altar of Damascus may seem more elegant and more convenient than the rough masonry He has required for His sacrifices; but we know what the consequence must be of bringing such furniture into His house. The temple will be more magnificent in all the showy pomp that strikes the outward eye; it will seem a grander and even a holier edifice to the carnal worshipper; but from its inmost shrines the terrible words, 'Let us depart hence,' will be pronounced, and the presiding Deity will quit for ever the polluted sanctuary.

The Papal monarchy is established on an elaborate system of checks and balances. Thus the secular clergy were employed to coerce or restrain the civil power—the monks to humble and control, when necessary, the secular clergy—and, as opportunity offered, new orders of monks were raised up to supply the defects or balance the preponderating influence of the old ones. At every period, you will observe, of an unusual activity on the part of Rome, some new monastic bodies,

suited to the times, are thrown forward as a cloud of skirmishers to cover the advance of her solid columns. It is by these that she works most effectually on the minds of the populace, and it is by identifying the interests of these with the power of the Pope, that that power has been eminently secured; for it is one of the exaggerations which help to give breadth and liveliness to the picture drawn by Mr. Macaulay, to represent as much greater than it is, the harmony between the secular and the regular clergy. The truth is, both co-operate effectually in working out the Pope's end; but they are for the most part far from working lovingly together. It is what the poet would call a 'well-according strife' between the two parties, which produces the great result of carrying out the Papal aims. It is not only Protestant Ordinaries that complain of the intrusion, or Protestant Bishops that shake their heads at the preachings of such benevolent ladies as Lady Huntingdon and Mrs. Fry; Popish Bishops and Popish Ordinaries do, or would do if they dared, the same to St. Selina and to Sister Caroline. If the prelates and college dignitaries of Spain had had the sole management of his case, Ignatius Loyola would have fared far worse at Salamanca than John Wesley did at Oxford. I am not speaking from conjecture merely, and it may be well to confirm my statements by a few anecdotes of Loyola, as they are told very amusingly by Bishop Stillingfleet:—'At Salamanca he received no kinder treatment than at Barcelona, being put into chains in the dungeon and examined. For here he follows his former course; he and his companions in an enthusiastical manner going up and down the streets, preaching in all places and to all sorts of persons; and being examined by the sub-prior what studies they followed, Ignatius very fairly confessed the truth that they were *unlearned*. He then asked them why they took on them to preach? Ignatius very subtilly told him they did not preach, they did only hold forth to the people in a familiar manner concerning virtue and vice, and thereby endeavour to bring them to the love of one and hatred of the other. The superior told him this

was preaching, which no one could pretend to but either by learning or by immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and since you do not pretend to learning, you must pretend to be inspired. Here Ignatius, finding himself caught, resolutely denied to give him any answer unless he were legally empowered to examine him. Say you so, said the sub-prior; I will take care of that suddenly. So they were three days kept in the convent, and after that, by order of the Bishop of Salamanca, were committed to close prison, where he preached to the people with great zeal, who now flocked in great numbers to him, and gloried as much in his sufferings and talked at the same rate that the ringleaders of the Quakers are wont to do among us.'[2]

This, I think, is more than a parallel for the misadventures of John Wesley and his friends at Oxford; and the truth is, that almost all the great founders of the monastic orders had to endure at first similar opposition from the constituted authorities till they found a shelter in the protection of the Popes.

But even under the Pope's shelter, the enmity between them and the regular clergy and the other orders did not cease. The interests of the two parties were constantly coming into collision and constantly causing fresh broils. Mr. Macaulay, indeed, tells us that 'the monk takes not a ducat from the revenue of the beneficed clergy;' but the beneficed clergy, if we will only listen to them, tell us a very different story. They tell us—I am quoting the words of Peter de Vineis—that by means of the monks the parish priests were brought under the greatest contempt, their dues being lessened so as to bring their incomes almost to nothing, and that they might as well pull down their churches, in which there was scarcely anything left but a bell and an old rusty image, while those holy friars, professing poverty, contrived to practise affluence, and, in another sense than the Apostles, having nothing, yet possessed all things.[3]

[2] *Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome*, 4th ed. pp. 311–12.

[3] *Epist.* l. 1. *Ep.* 37, Ibid. p. 409.

It is observable, indeed, how strongly this great struggle between the secular and the regular clergy has impressed traces upon the canon law; and the continued vacillation of the Popes, which its pages betray, does but little credit to the consistency of the Holy See. Let us take an instance or two.

Innocent IV. had conceded great privileges to the friars, but wearied out by the reclamations of the parochial clergy, had revoked them again, forbidding the friars to draw away the people from the parish churches on Sundays and holidays, or to admit any to penance who had not first confessed to their parish priest. Shortly after the publication of this Bull he died, and the friars were not slow in turning that circumstance to their account. It was said, of course, to have been a judgment. Some went even further. It was said that the friars had prayed for the Pope's death, and that the Virgin Mary, whenever they invoked her name, turned to her Son, and bade Him hear them. The report was current everywhere, and a profane speech, long passing as a kind of cant word at Rome—from the friars' litanies, Good Lord, deliver us—attested its general reception.[4] Alarmed, perhaps, by the fate of his predecessor, Alexander IV. called in that Bull and suspended its execution; but the contests still raging, Martin IV. endeavoured to interfere, and in two contradictory edicts, giving a triumph to neither party, played the part of Milton's old Anarch, who 'by deciding worse embroils the fray.' And then came Boniface VIII., with another Bull and another retractation, attended, as we might reasonably expect, with similar results. The state of things as it existed after all the efforts of these wonderful peacemakers is thus described in a Bull of Benedict XI., part of which I will translate, as a beautiful specimen of his Holiness' style, and also of his singular propriety in the application of Scripture:—

'We are bound,' he observes, 'so far as we are permitted from on high, to introduce peace, to remove scandals, to cut off the matter of strifes, and to consider the poor and needy,

---

[4] Bzovius, *Annal.* A.D. 1254, pp. 622-3.

because the poor will not alway be forgotten, and the patient abiding of the meek shall not perish for ever. Indeed, long since, our predecessor of blessed memory, Benedict VIII., made a certain decision between the prelates, rectors, and clergy of the parochial churches on the one part, and the Preaching and Minorite friars on the other; but instead of that quiet which he intended, disturbance hath been bred, instead of concord strife, and ever-springing disquietudes are rising up in the place of tranquillity. Thus, while he thought to cut off a handle, he bound a knot, and by amputating one head of a hydra, brought up seven.'[5]

After this preamble he goes most anxiously into a discussion of the whole matter, and makes a new settlement of all the questions in dispute, concluding as usual with the charitable denunciations of the anger of Almighty God, and the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, against all infringers of it. Yet this, too, was set aside by Clement V., who saw no better course open to him than to revert to that very constitution of Boniface VIII. which Benedict had described as embittering instead of allaying the disputes which it sought to decide.

I suspect, gentlemen, that you will think that this narrative does not reflect much credit upon the peacemaking powers of 'the old man at Rome.' Indeed the language of Clement with respect to the Bull of Benedict is almost identical with that of Benedict with respect to the Bull of Boniface. 'Whereas,' says he, 'formerly our predecessor, Boniface VIII., published a certain Decretal Epistle, and that was revoked by Benedict XI. in another which he substituted for it, but which, as the event has proved, was so far from producing the peace which its author expected from it, that it rather fomented in no slight degree the discord it was issued to appease; We therefore wholly disannul it, and at the instance and with the approbation of this sacred Council, renew that other published by the aforesaid Boniface.'[6]

---

[5] *Corp. Jur. Canon. Extrav. Commun. l.* v. *tit.* vii. cap. 1 *sub. init.*

[6] *Corp. Jur. Canon. Clement. l.* iii., *tit.* vii. cap. 2.

The Council of which Clement speaks in this Bull was the famous Council of Vienne, the ever-memorable Synod in which the order of the Templars was dissolved, and at which the privileges of the whole body of the monastic orders trembled fearfully in the balance. There is still extant a memoir drawn up, at the desire it would seem of Clement himself, by Durandus Mimatensis—*i.e.* Durand of Mendes in Aquitaine—in which he urges the Pope to revoke all exemptions granted to the friars as contrary to the ancient canons of the Church, by which all places and persons whatsoever were immediately under the jurisdiction of the Bishops; and he boldly maintains that the Pope neither ought nor could change this order of the Church. 'Because, the order of Bishops being appointed to prevent schisms in the Church, it could not attain its end if any persons were exempted from their jurisdiction. Even, however,' he goes on to argue, 'if it were in the Pope's power to grant such exemptions, it would be inexpedient for him to use that power, because the order of the Church would be destroyed by it, the Bishops despised, and the Church divided; since if the monastics paid no obedience to the Bishops, the people, from such an example, would soon learn to disobey them too. And supposing it had been expedient formerly, it would not be so then; because, though the monastic orders were founded in poverty, yet now their members had attained to such a height of intolerable pride and arrogance, that not only their abbots and priors, but the friars thought themselves equal to Bishops, and fit to be preferred before all ecclesiastical persons.'[7] These arguments are in fact the same as had been urged against the privileges of the friars from the very first by their opponents. One of the earliest, and perhaps the liveliest, but certainly not the discreetest of these, was the celebrated William de St. Amour, whose book on the 'Perils of the Last Days' was written and published in the name of the University of Paris, and which contains amongst other things a most curious application of St. Paul's well-known prophecy to the preaching friars of St. Dominic:—

---

[7] Stillingfleet, p. 106.

'They shall be lovers of themselves, not enduring reproof, covetous both of riches and applause; high-minded, because they would not be in subjection to their Bishops, but set before them, and therefore disobedient to their spiritual fathers. And such as these are said to creep into houses, which the ordinary gloss expounds of persons who enter into the houses of those under another's charge.' These, he shrewdly observes, 'enter not by the door as the rectors of churches do, but steal into them like thieves and robbers, and their leading captive silly women is their setting them against the Bishops and persuading them to enter into the cloister. Such persons,' he adds, 'though never so learned and holy, are false teachers, since they preach without being sent, and none are duly sent but such as are chosen and authorised by the Church, such as Bishops and Presbyters—the one of whom succeeds the Apostles, and the other the seventy disciples.'[8]

At the bottom, indeed, of the whole dispute between the secular and regular clergy lay the grand question of the nature of the Papal power; and it would seem that the friars, by accepting the Pope's patronage and resting their privileges upon his edicts, bound themselves to defend the highest theory of the Papal supremacy—that theory which regards all other ecclesiastical power as a mere scintilla, or emanation from the plenitude of authority vested in the Vicar of Christ. Nor can it be doubted, I think, that the Papacy did gain great accessions of strength from the support thus secured of the Mendicant orders. But it did not gain quite so much as we might at first suppose. There were elements of weakness imported into the system of the Church by those orders, which deserve to be noted if we would study history to any real advantage, and trace the effects which it records to their true causes.

In the first place, the two great families into which the Mendicants were divided soon rushed into angry collision with each other; and, unhappily, the subjects of their dispute were two questions most troublesome to the peace of the Church, and

---

[8] *De Periculis Noviss. Tempp.* Apud Stillingfleet, p. 403.

in which it was most dangerous for the Pope to take a side—Predestination, and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. Upon both these subjects the Dominicans held views which I cannot but regard as inconsistent with the full development of Romanism; and by the resistance which they offered successfully and so long to any definition upon them, they gave scope to an amount of free thought and free discussion that was most inconvenient, and a palpable violation of the image of absolute uniformity in all points of doctrine that reach the popular mind, which it is the policy of Rome to present. The mere speculative discussions of theologians upon matters of which the mass of the people know nothing, are things which the sovereign Pontiff feels to be safe and even desirable. But it is necessary that such discussions should not come abroad and agitate popular feeling. Upon everything that can disturb the thoughts of the great body of the faithful, it is needful that there should be some clear and definite decision, since repose from the doubt and uncertainty of private judgment is the grand compensation offered by Romanism for the implicit submission it demands. That two great schools of divines, therefore, within the very bosom of the Church, should brand each other with heresy upon the doctrines of grace—that the Franciscans should be charged with Pelagianism and the Dominicans with Manicheism—and that the observance of a festival like that of the Immaculate Conception, adopted with such zeal by so many Churches and sanctioned by so many Popes, should be denounced as a mortal sin from the pulpits of the Church itself—these were terrible phenomena, which had a disastrous aspect for a society that relies upon the semblance of unity for its claim to truth. Innocent little thought, when he sowed the dragon's teeth of Dominic and Francis, that the army which sprang from that seed would so soon turn their weapons upon each other.

But a second element requires also to be noticed. Not only were the Dominicans and the Franciscans at war with each other, but the Franciscans were at war among themselves. The original idea of Francis was that his family

should have absolutely no property in anything. But the inconvenience of this strict original Franciscanism was soon perceived by the wiser part to be intolerable; the principle was sometimes violated in practice without any attempt to reconcile the two, and sometimes a distinction was drawn between the property of the order and the property of the members of the order, sometimes between the use of a thing and the possession of it. To deliver his faithful children from this embarrassment, Pope Nicolas IV., who had himself been General of the Franciscans, and came to the Papal chair with all the prejudices of his order, struck out what seemed, no doubt, to himself a most fortunate idea. He declared that the *property* of all the goods of the order was in himself, the *use* of them in the brethren; thus kindly taking upon himself the guilt of the possession, and leaving the benefits of it to the innocent Franciscans. But in the Bull in which he promulgated this notable expedient, he went the length of declaring that 'the total abdication of all property, whether individual or corporate, for the sake of God, is meritorious and holy, which way of perfection Christ himself showed both in his teaching and his example, and which the first founders of the Church militant derived from the very fountain, and transmitted by their teaching and example also to the later monks.'[9]

But the quick eye of John XXII. did not fail to perceive the inconveniences and dangers that resulted from this famous Bull, and his resolute spirit at once encountered the difficulty in the boldest way. One inconvenience was this—that, in every the slightest interference with the goods enjoyed by the friars, the name and dignity of the Roman See was involved. If a breviary or a gown were stolen from a Franciscan, it must be reclaimed in the name of our Holy Father the Pope. How ludicrous such forms of process must have appeared you will at once understand from the similar case of our own army. In the case of a soldier the property of his regimentals is in the Queen, and in the case of their being

---

[9] *Corp. Jur. Can. Sexti Decret. lib.* v. *tit.* xii. cap. 3.

stolen, the indictment has to set forth that, *e.g.*, a pair of trousers, value ten shillings, belonging to our Sovereign Lady the Queen, has been feloniously abstracted. It is to similar cases, no doubt, that Pope John alludes when he asks indignantly: 'Is it not derogatory to the dignity of the Roman Church that it should be involved in perpetual litigation—sometimes in the ecclesiastical, sometimes in the secular courts, often before judges of the lowest rank, and generally about the most trivial matters?'

Another inconvenience was this, that by the arrangement of Nicolas a way was opened for entirely destroying the character of the Franciscans as a mendicant order, and enabling them to become practically as rich as the Benedictines. This point also is very forcibly put by John. 'The perfection of the Christian life,' says he, 'consists chiefly and essentially in charity, which the Apostle calls the bond of perfectness, and to this the way is prepared by the abdication of worldly goods, in so far as thereby we can cut off that solicitude about the acquisition, preservation, and management of them which temporal goods demand, and which generally is a distraction from perfect charity. But if such solicitude remain after the professed renunciation of property, then it is manifest that such a renunciation can contribute nothing to perfection. Now it is certain that since the promulgation of that Bull, the Friars Minorite have been no less solicitous about the acquisition and conservation of worldly goods than they were before it.'[1]

These inconveniences, however, would have been comparatively trifling, if it were not that by the rash zeal of Nicolas IV. he had placed his order on an eminence above all the rest, and made the very peculiarity of the rule of Francis—the peculiarity in which it differed from all other rules—the exact model of Christian perfection. But there was more involved in the matter than this. So far, only the laxer Franciscans were concerned, who, under the cover of a disgraceful subtlety, were content to enjoy all the same advantages as the other

---

[1] *Corp. Jur. Can. Extrav. Ad Condit. Joan.* xxii. *tit.* xiv. cap. 3.

monastic orders, and yet claim a superiority over them in this fictitious poverty. But there was another, and far more dangerous class embraced by the rule of St. Francis, and I cannot but think the genuine disciples of that crazy saint, the spiritual Franciscans. With them the doctrine of absolute poverty was no fiction, but construed with such a strictness as not merely to offend their more carnal brethren and the other monks, but to subvert the very foundations of the Roman Church.

NOTE.—In the *Irish Church Journal* for May, 1855, there was an article entitled 'On the Use of Fanaticism in the Church of Rome,' which immediately commended itself as the Bishop's writing. It commenced with the address 'Gentlemen,' which, though it might have meant the Editors of the Journal, yet suggested that, as in another instance, it was one of the Lectures, or at least part of one, on Ecclesiastical History. It was signed 'M. D.' It will be observed that these are the terminal letters of the Bishop's name, and we know that he was familiar with this mode of signature. The article concluded with the words 'seven hydra heads for the one it had cut off.' We fancied on the reading the latter part, that we had seen some expressions which it used in a loose leaf in the Bishop's handwriting. This leaf was found with some others of a like nature, and it was discovered that enough of the printed matter was on this leaf to identify the former as certainly part of one of the Lectures. After much search and pains the sequel was discovered in disjointed portions, the connection between the several pages being clear and unbroken. The Lecture was thus restored, and has its fitting place in the position we have assigned it.—EDITORS.

LECTURE X.

COMPARISON OF THE DOMINICANS AND FRANCISCANS.

Gentlemen,—There is, it seems to me, a striking resemblance in some particulars between the characters of the two great founders of the two grand families of friars whose fortunes we have been tracing, on the one hand, and those of the two great founders of the two grand families of English Methodists on the other. In Dominic we may trace the features of that same severe, governing, systematic genius which we recognise afterwards in John Wesley. In Francis that same impulsive, emotional, and sometimes wildly eccentric ardour which characterised Whitefield. Neither Francis nor Whitefield had the least capacity for framing a constitution or moulding a permanent scheme of social government. Their thoughts were entirely occupied with the work to be done, not with the details of the machinery for effecting it. They both assumed that their followers would be animated with the same flaming zeal and entire self-devotion that animated themselves, and that these strong emotions would suffice without the politic contrivances which cooler calculation would have discovered to be necessary. Hence, to a great extent, the irregularity—the almost anarchical disorder—which soon began to prevail in the families which they respectively founded.

Dominic and Wesley, on the other hand, united to a zeal no less ardent than that of their rivals, the commanding practical intellects of legislators and rulers, and they stamped upon their respective societies the characters which such

minds were fitted to impress—they gave them that regularity and compactness of consolidation which must strike every attentive observer as some of their chief characteristics.

But while these were their general resemblances, it is curious to observe that in other respects there was a contrast equally strongly marked. In some of their theological opinions—setting apart, of course, those portions of theology in which Protestants and Roman Catholics could never possibly have any common ground—Whitefield is to be classed with Dominic, and Wesley with Francis.

In the great questions of grace and predestination, Whitefield and Dominic were what we should now call Calvinistical, and Wesley and Francis Arminian. The truth is, that considered as developments of Romanism, both the Franciscan and the Dominican theologies were imperfect and inconsistent in themselves. It will be useful to mark this a little more in detail, and then to see whether we can discover the causes of the phenomena.

In the first place, then, the theology of the Dominicans was, as we have said, Augustinian. They not only held, but strenuously defended those views of predestination and grace which Rome ultimately felt so repugnant to the genius of her system that, with a mighty effort, convulsing the Church to its centre, she cast them off, with the sacrifice of some of her most illustrious sons, in the Jansenists of the seventeenth century; and she proscribed them in decrees so stringent and terms so precise, that modern Dominicans can only shelter themselves from the anathema which blasted the more honest Jansenists, by evasions as contemptible as those miserable subtleties which made Tract 90 infamous in its short day of mischief.

Again, as I have already said, the Dominicans not only held, but strenuously maintained, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin, though they allowed (and that admission threw a whimsical air of triviality over the whole dispute) that in the moment after conception she was wholly

delivered from its taint. And here again they held an element uncongenial, as experience has fully proved, with Romanism. For I do think that, in following out the prevailing tendency in that Church by an authoritative definition of the Immaculate Conception, Rome has acted in conformity with the imperative requirements of her position. Mary—I do not mean the Blessed Virgin herself, but the goddess Mary, the mythical image of legend and fancy—is far too important a person in her system to have any portion of her supposed privileges left in doubt, or made the subject of free discussion. It is necessary that her attributes and powers should become matters of faith, as well as the attributes and powers of the Deity Himself; and matters of faith they cannot become in the Church of Rome, but by a definition emanating from the infallible tribunal of faith. And the necessity of a definition once admitted, it is easy to see on which side of the question the definition must be made. The fundamental thought that lies at the bottom of the whole mythical edifice on which that image is enthroned is, that no possible privilege or honour—short of pure Deity itself—can be denied to the Mother of God; that she who was counted worthy of so great an honour, as that of giving birth to the Incarnate Word, must justly claim every possible honour that any creature can conceivably obtain. And as exemption from conception in original sin is clearly to our minds separable from the idea of a human creature, hence to deny this to one, to whom everything else is granted, seems an unreasonable and inconsistent checking of a development, which proceeds, and can proceed, from nothing but the ardent impulse of adoration to heap every possible perfection upon the object of its worship.

Upon these two points, then, as I said, the Dominican theology—considered as that of a Romish school—appears to me imperfect and inconsistent with the genius of the religious system with which it should have intimately cohered; and in these portions of the Dominican theology lay, as it appears to me, the certain seeds of that weakness which after a long time

betrayed itself in the paralysis of that once active and domineering order.

Compared with the Dominican in these respects alone, the Franciscan theology would wear an aspect far more decidedly Roman. But upon other points that advantage was not maintained. When we turn to the doctrine of the Sacraments, for instance, we find the Dominicans supporting, perhaps originating, the view which afterwards became the settled one of the Roman Church. And this is the more remarkable because the high doctrine of the *opus operatum* seems specially repugnant to the Augustinian theory, and cannot be engrafted upon it without some violence—a violence which all the wonderful skill of Thomas Aquinas cannot conceal. The whole drift of the Augustinian theory is surely to bring God into immediate contact with the soul of man, excluding intermediate agencies; and with this the Franciscan doctrine of the Sacraments would have completely agreed. The outward rite—the Sacrament properly so called—the Franciscans regarded as only the prescribed condition or occasion upon which God directly and immediately Himself conferred grace upon the fitting receiver. They allowed no force or efficiency to the Sacrament itself. It was, in their view, only God's arbitrary positive institution which made the performance of the outward Sacrament a mark and condition of his own inward working. The Sacraments, therefore, they compared to the established ceremonies by which powers and dignities were conferred by human authority. It was, they said, as when a doctor was made by the delivery of a book, an abbot by a ring and staff. There was no supernatural quality attached to the element; but the rite derived its whole efficacy from the simultaneous operation of the Divine Institutor. It is with an inward consciousness of the inconsistency of his position, and under an apparent pressure from some other source, that Thomas endeavours to make his way good to a higher estimate of the Sacraments, and the establishment of a claim to some proper efficiency in the outward element. He shrinks indeed back with horror from the idea that after-

wards prevailed through the influence of the Jesuit divines, that water or oil can directly produce grace upon the soul, yet he seems coerced into maintaining that they do produce something. And hence results the strange and incomprehensible doctrine—strange in an Augustinian, strange in a writer who is generally one of the most intelligible of all the Schoolmen—that the Sacraments, by a supernatural quality imparted to the outward element, produce in the substance of the soul a certain impressed character or ornament which though not grace itself prepares the soul and makes it a fit recipient of grace.

In this odd—nay ludicrous expedient—which nevertheless seems the best that one of the strongest of human intellects could devise for his purpose, I see another evidence of the inherent weakness of the Dominican theology, another instance of its arbitrarily stopping short in the process of a development at a point where rest could no longer be tenably maintained.

The Franciscans surely were far more consistent. In the development of excessive honour to the Virgin, moving with it at all, they went the whole length. In the development of excessive honour to the Sacraments, not choosing to go the whole length, they would not move at all. But here, though in refusing to move at all, they made their own system in itself more philosophically consistent and logically tenable, they, as signally as the Dominicans, betrayed an inconsistency with the spirit and tendency of Romanism. Both these great families were left behind by the body of the Church, who, leaving them to dispute in their empty schools, pressed eagerly after new and more popular teachers in the persons of the Jesuits, whose theology retained and combined whatever elements of strength were to be found in the theologies of their predecessors; rejecting, after a short trial—for it is remarkable that the earlier Jesuits were Augustinian—rejecting after a short trial, the predestinarian theories of the Dominicans, accepting the hearty Mariolatry of the Franciscans, and carrying out the doctrine of the efficiency of the Sacraments to its utmost

point of extravagance. This would seem to be the only possible combination that remained :

> The force of Nature could no further go,
> To make a third she joined the former two.

Many other orders of friars have indeed sprung up in the Church of Rome; but, as far as I can see, there have been no other schools of theology founded by any orders but these three.

LECTURE XI.

COMPARISON BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN MONASTICISM—ELEMENTS OF DANGER TO THE PAPACY IN THE LATTER.

GENTLEMEN,—In my last lecture I gave a hasty glance at those continually recurring struggles between the monastic orders and the parochial clergy by which the Church in the middle ages was agitated; and I pointed out to you how dearly in some respects the Popes purchased the support of the monks in controlling the secular priests, and reducing them to a dependence on the Roman See.

The truth is, that there was a peculiar element mixing with the monasticism of those ages which was formidable alike to the Pope himself and to the inferior Bishops, and which threatened with destruction the whole system of worldly dominion which monasticism was employed to help in carrying out.

The circumstance I allude to is the claim of some of the Western monastic orders to restore the model of true spiritual Christianity, as founded by Christ and His Apostles.

The Western monasticism of the middle ages was a reaction carried to an excess from the worldliness of the Church in those ages. There was in it not merely the complexity of causes which produced the monasticism of the East, but something more besides, of which I can discern few if any traces in the Oriental monks.

The monasticism of the East can hardly be said to have originated in Christian ideas at all. It sprang from a modification of Christianity by the pre-existing ideas familiar to the Eastern mind, which had already produced similar effects

on the Judaism and Paganism of those regions. There was nothing in the exterior aspect of Oriental monasticism which could strike anyone as at all resembling the manner of the life of Christ and His Apostles; while on the other hand it plainly continued on the type of the Essene communities of the Jews, and the Brachmans and Shamans of Hindustan. It was of these, and not of the Apostles, that the anchorets who peopled the deserts of Nitria, and the wild fanatics who mounted their solitary pillars in the Syrian plains, were the legitimate descendants. And the principles working in these modifications of Christianity were those pervading ones which have been conveniently described as Soofeeism and Buddhism. Soofeeism is the conception of matter and all the relations connected with it as inherently evil, and of perfection as attainable only by abstract contemplation of the Deity. Buddhism is the principle of self-torture as a method of expiating some inherent guilt, and of the merits of pain and suffering as something intrinsically valuable, and capable of purchasing eternal rewards. These working more or less covertly their way into Christianity were, I think, the direct sources of Eastern monachism, though their operation was no doubt assisted by other causes also. Such were the natural tendency of sensitive or indolent minds to fly from the temptations and annoyances of domestic and civil life, the disgust of disappointed ambition, the inextinguishable remorse for atrocious crimes, the love of singularity, the love of fame; and, as time went on, and the influence of the monks upon the populace became overwhelming, the love of power. The monks in the East constituted thus a kind of spiritual aristocracy, and even at particular periods seem practically to have ruled the Church, partly by their moral and partly by their physical force. And the extraordinary weight which the Patriarchs of Alexandria (as in the cases of Athanasius and Cyril) derived from their monkish militia, may have suggested the thought to the Roman Patriarch of organising a similar army under his own command. But while the Eastern monks were thus in many instances all-powerful,

they do not, I think, ever come before us as direct rivals of the parochial clergy. They seem never to have formed the idea of substituting their own ministrations for those of the parish priests or Bishops, but rather to have looked down on such ministrations as infinitely beneath them. Their ambition was to govern Patriarchs and Bishops, not to take their place.

Monasticism in the West was at first a direct importation from the East, and as such it retained in its beginnings much of the same character. But soon a new, a more practical, and a more Christian element, began to display itself. Mixing with the Gnostical or semi-Gnostical principles of the East, came a reforming tendency, a revulsion from the worldliness of the Church, a wish to fall back upon a simpler model of primitive and evangelic purity. It cannot be denied, I think, that what gave such an amazing impulse to the Franciscan and Dominican movements was a feeling of strong contrast between the image of the Apostolic Church and that of the Church as it existed in their own day and under their own eyes. When a stern ascetic man like Hildebrand sat in the Papal chair, the reforming movement of the Church went strongly with him, because his power was contemplated as a necessary instrument for eradicating the deep-seated abuses which defied any weaker means. But after a while the aspect of things began to change. The hierarchy had to a great extent, indeed, thrown off the yoke of the temporal lords, but it was only to become a great temporal aristocracy themselves. Worldliness shut out at one door had made its entrance through another, and, though in a different guise, seemed as general and as rampant as before. It is natural for ignorant and narrow minds to confound together what is accidental with that which is essential. Like our own sectaries, men in the middle ages were often unable to distinguish, in the example of our Lord and His Apostles, the spirit of their behaviour from the external form of it. They did not perceive that the poverty, the dependence on their own labour or the contributions of the faithful, which distinguished the

Apostolic teachers from those of their own times, was the result not of choice but of necessity, and that 'the world' against the influence of which they warned their followers was not mere rank, or riches, or business, or comfort, in themselves, but the corruptions and abuses of the godless society by which they were surrounded. The idea then which was before the leaders of the monastic reforming movements in the age I speak of, was very much the same idea as was before the leaders of some of our sterner Protestant sects—the idea of reviving not so much the spirit of Apostolic Christianity, as the very outward form which Christian life exhibited in the beginning, in consequence of the peculiar circumstances of being in a state of persecution and being surrounded by a pagan world. Thus the monasticism of that age contained in it, as I said, an element hostile not only to the inferior secular clergy, but to the Papacy itself. It was impossible that men possessed with such ideas should not perceive and feel that a Prelate clothed in purple and fine linen, dwelling in a golden palace, and exercising the authority of a Prince, nay of an Emperor, was utterly unlike the poor fisherman in whose chair he claimed to sit. The antagonism of the reforming monastic spirit to the proper hierarchical genius of Popery displays itself already in one whom Roman Catholics are apt to regard as one of the main columns of the Papacy. I mean Bernard of Clairvaux. In him Western monachism becomes almost as completely dominant as Eastern monachism had been in the fifth and sixth centuries. Popes, Councils, Bishops, all the functions of the established hierarchy, sink into insignificance before him, and the Abbot of Clairvaux stands out manifestly as the ruling spirit of Europe. But this sway of dominant monasticism is not exercised as it had been in the East, merely to put down or to raise up some theological party, to exalt a favourite or dethrone an enemy. It is, indeed, to some extent thus exercised, as in the cases of Abelard and Arnold of Brescia. But in general it is for higher objects, and eminently for restoring purity to the Church both in its head and members. Bernard was in fact

a Pope-maker and a Pope-teacher. He had really created Pope Eugenius, and having done so he solemnly gives him a kind of charge in which he shows what, in his conception, a Pope ought to be.[1] That conception did indeed involve much of the same powers Hildebrand had asserted. The Pontiff was to be one who should bind kings in chains and princes in links of iron, but worldly wealth and splendour formed no part of that conception. So far from allowing pomp and luxury to the Courts of Prelates, Bernard will not allow them even to the temples of God; and certainly some modern admirers of mediæval Christianity would be somewhat startled, if they were as much inclined to read the great Doctors of those times as to talk about them. 'Men have found,' he says, 'the art of multiplying money by squandering it. It is spent to be increased, its profusion makes it plenty. By the mere sight of these sumptuous and wondrous vanities, the spectators are stimulated rather to offer gifts than prayers: for, I know not why, the more wealth is seen in any church, there oblations are made so much the more freely. By reliques set in gold the eyes are feasted and the purse is opened. A beautiful form of some male or female saint is exhibited, and it is thought all the more holy in proportion as it is more richly coloured. Men run to kiss it, and are invited to make a donation, but it is rather admiration of beauty, than veneration of holiness, that influences them. Wheels rather than crowns are displayed in the churches, surrounded with lights, yet glittering even more bright with the precious stones wherewith they are bestudded. Instead of candlesticks, things like trees shoot up, heavy with a ponderous weight of brass and exquisitely wrought in curious workmanship, nor shining more gloriously with the candles they support than with the gems that cover them. What do you think is the object of all this? Is it the compunction of the penitents or the admiration of the beholders? O vanity of vanities, but not more vain than it is mad. The Church

---

[1] His letter to Pope Eugenius on this occasion will be found in Baron. *Annal.* ad an. 1145, vol. xii. p. 307C–309A.

shines in its walls, but is in misery in its poor members. It covers its stones with gold and leaves its children naked. The eyes of the rich are ministered to by what should be spent upon the needy. The curious find enough to amuse them, but the wretched cannot find enough to support them. But at least we should show some respect to the images of the saints with which even the pavement is covered. Often the worshipper spits in the face of an angel, or beats the countenance of a saint with his heel.'[1]

But the most remarkable proof of the existence of such an element as I speak of in mediæval monachism is to be found in the strange development of fanaticism in the Franciscan order in the thirteenth century. It is indeed related that Francis and Dominic were seen in vision by Innocent the Third, supporting the tottering fabric of the Lateran Church,[2] and the imagination of some Roman Catholic writers absolutely runs riot in seeking out types of those great supporters. 'They are the two great lights of heaven, the two trumpets of Moses, the two cherubims, the two breasts of the spouse, the two olive branches, the two candlesticks, the two witnesses, almost all the noted twos in the Bible,' says Stillingfleet, 'except the two thieves and two calves at Dan and Bethel.' But I cannot but agree with Mosheim in thinking that whoever considers with attention the series of events that happened in the Latin Church from the foundation of those orders, will be fully convinced that the mendicant orders gave several mortal blows to the authority of the Church of Rome, and excited in the minds of the people those ardent desires of a reformation of the Church which produced afterwards such substantial effects. Take, for example, the views of Pierre d'Oliva, who saw in

---

[1] *Apologia ad Gulielmum*, c. 12.

[2] Bzovius, *Annal. Eccl. post Baronium*, ad an. 1215–16. Bzovius gives the statement in this form :—'Secundum visum in somnis aspexit, Lateranensem basilicam lapsantem, a Divo Dominico fulciri, dum ille humeros ruinosæ fabricæ supposuisset et magnâ virtute sustentasset.' The *ille* in this must refer to Francis, the only person named besides Innocent within several lines. For while in the index under Innocent III. he only mentions Dominic, under Francis he refers to the same place for the mention of his appearance also.—EDITORS.

Francis the restorer of the very gospel of Christ. 'As Vashti,' says he, 'being cast off from the kingdom and marriage of Ahasuerus, the humble Esther was chosen to succeed in her place, and the king made a great feast to princes and servants, so in this last state of the Church, the adulterous Babylon, the carnal Church, being rejected, the spiritual Church must be exalted, and the great spiritual feast be kept to celebrate these nuptials. Under the mystical Antichrist there shall be upturnings and commotions by which the carnal Church shall be terribly stirred up and moved against the evangelical spirit of Christ. But the Babylonian harlot, the carnal Church, shall fall. That harlot,' he goes on to say, 'is the Roman Church, which hath committed fornication with the world, having departed from the worship and sincere love of Christ her spouse, and embraced the world, the riches and the pleasures of it, and the devil, kings, and princes and prelates, and all the lovers of this world.'

The distinctive principles of these spiritual Franciscans were:—1. The assertion of two Churches, the carnal wealthy Church, under the Popes, the spiritual and poor one of St. Francis. 2. The denial of the validity of the acts and sacraments of the carnal Church. 3. The unlawfulness of oaths. 4. The assertion that the unworthiness of a priest invalidated the sacrament. 5. That they alone fulfilled the gospel of Christ.[3]

In some respects the system of the spiritual Franciscans

---

[3] The full account of his heresies condemned by John XXII. will be found drawn up by Eymericus, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, p. 11, qu. 9. He appears to have belonged to the latter part of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth. He was known as Petrus Joannis, Johannes Petrus Olivi, and with other variations of his name. In the continuation of the *Annals* of Baronius by Bzovius, he is assigned to the year 1199, with an abbreviated statement of his opinions as adopted from the Abbot Joachim. In this account mention is made of his book on the Apocalypse, afterwards solemnly condemned. From the notices of his errors given by Bzovius, it is evidently the same Peter John that is intended. But the confusion is due to the long interval between his becoming a follower of Joachim and the condemnation of his writings. The book must evidently have been written after the establishment of the Franciscans, and after the death of St. Francis in 1226.—EDITORS.

bore a marked resemblance to the early heresy of the Montanists. The fundamental principle on which they proceeded was that of a second outpouring of the Holy Ghost in the latter times, to renovate the Church and bring it back to its first principles of unworldliness. The Apocalypse, of course, was their favourite book, and the Commentary upon it of Peter Oliva was one of the most popular works that served to maintain and recommend their cause. That work itself is, I fear, not now in existence, but the exposition of the seven seals which it contained is preserved in a report of an inquisitorial commission by which it was examined. Oliva regarded the seven seals as emblematic of seven successive ages of the Church. 1. That of its foundation by the Apostles. 2. The age of martyrs. 3. The age of exposition of the faith. 4. That of the Anchorets. 5. That of the monastic orders. 6. That of the renovation of the evangelic life by St. Francis, and the overthrow of Antichrist. 7. The Millennium.[4]

It certainly is not easy to guess upon what grounds such an exposition could have been supported. But the prophetic expositors of those days did not stand on trifles, and at least it must be confessed that in the important point of the number seven there was an exact agreement between the ages and the seals.[5]

---

[4] See the extracts from his *Postilla super Apocalypsi*, drawn up by command of John XXII., and published by Baluze in his *Miscell. Sacra*, tom. ii.—EDITORS.

[5] The above is followed in the MS. by the words: 'This anti-Roman development of the Franciscan . . . .' It is plain, therefore, that something else was intended to follow, the leaf being only about one-fourth filled. The probability seems to be that the writer was called away and finished the Lecture extempore. So far, however, as the Lecture extends in MS., it is sufficiently complete in itself. It is probable, however, that he gave in the unwritten part an account of those 'striking features of the Scholastic theology,' to which he refers in the first sentence of the Lecture which we have placed next in order.—EDITORS.

LECTURE XII.

THE SCHOOLMEN—THEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE.

Gentlemen,—At the close of my last lecture I was endeavouring to point out some of the most striking features that characterise the Scholastic theology. I said that the fundamental conception of it was of a science eminently speculative. To many of us in the present day, brought up under different influences and with far other views, it may be at first a matter of some difficulty to understand how theology should be conceived of as in strictness of speech a science. For human science is, in logical strictness, the certain and evident knowledge of a thing by its necessary cause, or the knowledge acquired by demonstrative reasoning from self-evident principles. Now, except within the narrow confines of natural theology, there might seem to be no room for science in this sense about religious matters; since so far as our acquaintance with supernatural truths is derived from revelation, it seems ultimately resolvable in its final analysis into the evidence of matters of fact, i.e. some degree, however high, of probability, not intuitive principles and demonstrative deductions from them. The proof that we have of the divine authority of the Christian revelation itself, is manifestly only probable proof, establishing a moral, not a scientific certainty; and therefore, wherever in theology the authority of that revelation is assumed, there is manifestly, it would seem, imported into our syllogisms a merely probable premiss, which according to the well-known rule of logic, that the conclusion follows the weaker part, must render everything immediately or remotely deduced from it merely probable also.

In order to save their favourite study from the effects of such obvious reasoning as this, the Schoolmen had recourse to the idea of what they called 'the divine faith,' an idea which has since become the corner stone of the Romish system, which was adopted from the Romanists by most of the earlier Protestants, but which, from the time of Hooker at least, has been generally abandoned in our schools.

They observed that the only importance of self-evident clearness in the principles of human science was to give those principles a manifest certainty to our minds, so as to produce an infallible assurance of them. Now this infallible assurance was, they contended, produced in the minds of the members of the true Church by the supernatural gift of faith, which, without infusing any self-evidence into the propositions themselves, gave them in the minds of believers an infallible certainty not only equal to, but greater than that of the principles of any human science whatever. Thus theology was established not only as a science, but as the first and the mistress of all sciences. All other sciences took their principles as certain, because self-evident to the human mind. But theology took its principles, embracing them by a divine faith, as self-evident to the mind of God and the glorified saints. Hence theology had a right to judge all other sciences. 'Whatever,' says St. Thomas, 'is found in other sciences repugnant to the truth of this one, is wholly condemned by it as false.' Theology was the test, the Lydian stone, by whose touch all other knowledge was to be tried.

You must endeavour, gentlemen, to fix in your minds this principle of the Scholastic theology, or you will never have a clear and systematic conception of its history, and of the controversies which have grown out of it; especially of the great controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics upon the rule of faith. And in order to make it more plain, I would remark that here the two great schools of the Mystics and the rational Schoolmen branched off. The principle of the divine faith, you see, admits an assurance infused into the mind over and above that produced by the natural force

of rational argument. The arguments by which the authority of revelation is proved are, after all, as we said, but probable arguments, and ever of themselves produce but moral certainty. Whatever is produced over and above that must be produced by some supernatural cause operating upon the mind, not in the way of rational argument. The Mystics laid hold of this admission. Here was an agency producing something above knowledge immediately in the soul, a self-revelation of God directly to the creature; and hence the tendency of their system was to discard as superfluous the logical process altogether, and seek for communion with the Deity by withdrawing the attention at once from the disturbance of the senses and the busy activity of the understanding, lying patient as it were under the sole illuminating influence of the Divine Spirit.

This course, however, was rejected by the rational Schoolmen. Divine faith, according to them, was not substituted for moral certainty. It was moral certainty elevated, and as it were transfigured and glorified, by supernatural grace. They perceived no doubt the danger which might be expected, and which actually did result, from the too free application of the mystic principle which resolved everything into the inward feeling of the mind, a knowledge which could not be checked or measured by any standard but its own persuasions. They felt, as all men of sense really feel at bottom, however they may talk of divine infallible faith, that there was actually no preservative against mistaking the wildest dreams of enthusiasm for the revelations of the Divine Spirit, but the comparison of those dreams with some rational standard; and that, after all, the moral certainty of reason must be called in to pass its word for the validity of the convictions of infallible faith. Besides, their taste was for reasoning. They did not want to get rid of it, but only to gain a higher value for its processes and their results. They disdained to free themselves by the principle of a supernatural agency from any labour of logical proof. So far from wishing in any instance to escape that labour, it was to them a labour of love. Their

ingenuity was tasked to the utmost to discover new regions of inquiry, new questions to be stated, new difficulties to be solved. And if in their day some Locke or Kant had arisen and pointed out to them the narrow limits of the human faculties, they would have wept at the scantiness of the intellectual orb, and mourned that there was no further world to be subdued by syllogism. Men who could write volumes upon such questions as whether the species by which angels understand are taken from the things themselves, or infused by God;—whether angels can be properly said to reason;—whether inferior angels can be strictly said to comprehend superior ones;—whether angels were created in sanctifying grace;—whether an angel could sin in the very instant of his creation;—whether all the angels created by God are necessarily specifically different each from each?—men, I say, who could gravely discuss such questions at interminable length, and make them subjects of keen controversy with each other, were plainly under no temptation to get rid of the burthen of proof in any department of science. What they sought rather was scope for the incessant exercise of a restless activity of ratiocination. Reasoning had become with them a passion, an enthusiasm, and might almost seem to have swallowed up all other passions.

For nothing perhaps is more marvellous than the almost total disappearance of the colouring of ordinary human passions in the writings of the Schoolmen. Except an occasional malediction upon some noted heretic, bestowed in a word and quite in a passing way, there is scarcely a trace of human feeling from one end to the other of their arid disquisitions. At first sight we might be apt to pronounce them models of severe, unbiassed, searchers after truth. But upon closer observation we soon discover our mistake; and their example may serve to show us how little mere dialectical skill can avail as a security for the attainment of truth, if the pure love of it be wanting.

The utmost that the art of logic can contribute is but the armour and the discipline necessary for accomplishing the

knight. In what cause and for what objects the weapons shall be wielded, to what ends the practised skill of the intellectual warrior shall be subordinated, these are not a question of thought, to be resolved merely by the understanding, but a practical one to be determined by the will. Whether the trained logician shall prove a mere mercenary man-at-arms, selling his skill and reputation to the highest bidder, at the best price they may bring in the market of corruption—or whether he shall roam the world, as a sort of intellectual knight-errant in quest of hardy adventures as an amusement for his restless activity, and a gratification of his vanity of reason—or whether he shall be a just and loyal champion valiant for the truth, these are points which depend not so much on the accuracy of our reasonings as on the integrity of our characters.

But there are many upon whom the grosser temptations to swerve from their loyalty to truth which spring from such principles as avarice, ambition, or vanity, have little influence, but who nevertheless are drawn from her service, in a way more honourable indeed, but not less fatal. In the old legends of chivalry to which I have been alluding, there are not only caitiff knights who sell their skill and strength for gold and rank, or wild adventurers led on by a mere mad love of danger, or thirst for vulgar renown; but sometimes the courteous and honourable cavalier is represented as falling under the power of a strange and magical fascination, which makes him the slave of its evil influence, and blinds not so much his conscience as his judgment to the real character of those whom he encounters. A similar spell binds many a powerful intellect in the shape of prejudices deeply rooted in the mind, which appear certain truths and infallible principles only because we have never dared seriously to question them. It is even possible that the very habit of logical exercise may, by a sad perversion, be made a means of strengthening and consolidating such prejudices. Reasoning, in the sense in which logic deals with it, is the reduction of questioned or doubted truths to the terms of unquestioned ones. It pre-

supposes for its application something fixed as a standard, and it applies that standard as a test. Now the more we have been accustomed to apply any proposition in this way as a standard or test of the truth of others, the more is the habit strengthened of considering it as a thing itself beyond question. It is made the corner stone in the structure of our knowledge, and we feel that, if it were withdrawn, a great, perhaps the most valued portion of the fabric, would fall to ruin, and we should have to begin the erection of the edifice again upon a new and untried foundation and a different plan. It is thus that the prejudices of the learned are often more obstinate and more mischievous than those of the vulgar. The prejudices of the vulgar extend their influence little further than some particular error. They are not systematic; they do not draw after them any long train of remote consequences. They are not reasoned upon; they are often incapable of being reasoned upon, and the very attempt to do it would be enough to dissipate them. But the prejudices of philosophers owe much of their peculiar tenacity to the very circumstance of their being so much reasoned upon; and the self-consistency of the systems into which they are brought gives an imposing air of truth, while it extends on all sides the pernicious influence of the error. 'The prejudices of the learned,' says Fontenelle, 'are more pernicious than those of the vulgar, because the learned besot themselves not only with the prejudice but with the premises on which it is built, and the consequences that follow from it.'

Now that dogma of a divine, infallible, certainty of faith, of which we have been speaking, and which formed the corner stone of the Scholastic edifice, was, I think, a prejudice of this kind. What all the School doctors set out with was the same complete, unhesitating acquiescence in the established doctrines of the Church, as characterised the merest vulgar of their day. They set out with the complete conviction that they were already in possession of truth—not to find it, but to find arguments in defence of it, and consequences from it. They were too keen-sighted not to be conscious that such

arguments as they could find for those doctrines could not, by the mere force of natural evidence, produce such a conviction as they felt within themselves; and instead of resolving the overplus of assurance into the natural causes which, in a thousand other cases, make belief exceed the proper results of proof, they chose to account for it by supernatural grace, and that the more readily, because such a supposition enabled them to convert their favourite study into a master-science controlling all the rest.

And, as I said, they regarded theology not only as a science, but a science eminently speculative. This view of it also is repugnant to the notions latterly most prevalent among Protestant divines. We are accustomed to regard revelation as made solely with a practical view, not primarily to enlighten the understanding, but to enlighten the understanding as far as is necessary to excite our practical feelings and guide our conduct. But the Schoolmen had inherited, as I observed, from the pagan philosophers, through the philosophic Fathers of the Church, another principle which led them to frame a different system. That principle was the preference of contemplation to action which had long become an established prejudice in Christendom, which lay at the foundation of the whole monastic system, and which therefore would specially commend itself to the minds of monks.

LECTURE XIII.

SÆCULUM SYNODALE—CONDEMNATION OF HUSS.

Gentlemen,—We now arrive at a great era in the history of the Church—the age that has been emphatically called Sæculum Synodale, the Age of the Councils. It was so called not because Councils were more frequently held in that age than in any other, but because such assemblies then assumed an unusual importance, and appeared in a character which for many centuries they had not borne in the Church. We have been tracing in the last lecture some of the chief causes that led to this phenomenon. I do not intend now to go over them again. I will only remind you that we observed that the force which really elevated the Popes to that preeminent position which they held at the height of their power, and made them practically autocrats in the Churches, and hardly less in the States of Europe, was in its essence a reforming spirit, a spirit of reform in many respects mistaken and misdirected, but still an earnest and sincere desire for what it regarded as purity of discipline in the Church.

But, as I also then observed, experience after a little time convinced all the most earnest reformers that such hopes, as had been conceived at first of a purification to be effected by the dictatorial power of the Roman See, were hopes that 'made ashamed.' The vision which had been before the reformers was that of the visible Church rendered conformable to its idea as a pure Church, 'glorious, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing;' and this happy consummation they hoped to effect by the transcendent power of the Roman

Bishop, by freeing the hands of the Vicar of Christ from all the ties which could prevent him from executing judgment in any part of Christendom, and making all, princes and prelates, high and low, rich and poor, alike the absolute servants of his supreme and unlimited authority. When the reality came it was a sad, a shocking contrast to this vision. There is no gainsaying the force of evidence—no resisting the weight of testimony, not from the mouths of heretics or schismatics or rebellious agitators, but confessions wrung from the lips of the best and most devoted members and friends of the hierarchy itself. These show that the moral condition of the Church in Europe, under this plenitude of the Papal power, in the full noontide of Roman supremacy, when every lesser star of authority had vanished from the firmament, lost and dissolved in the scorching splendour of the Papal luminary, was worse if possible, and more hopeless, than it had been at the very time when the desperate remedy of a Papal despotism had been devised and consented to. If we look at the speeches and documents upon which the great Council of Constance proceeded, we shall see disclosed a state of things that, even at this distance of time, makes one shudder to contemplate it. I could not adduce one hundredth part of it, and much of it is of such a nature that one would be willingly spared the pain of even reading it in private. It is a shame even to speak of those things which were done of them, not merely in secret, but almost in the eye of the world, in the face of day. There we have the great prelates of the Church described as emulating in ferocity, in rapacity, in luxury, the worst of the temporal barons; the secular clergy living some, the more decent of them, in almost open and avowed concubinage—the worst, seducing and defiling every woman whom their arts could entangle; the convents, some little better than marts or inns, others as bad if not worse than common brothels—and most horrible of all, the very head and chief quarters of corruption was in the Court of Rome itself—

Hoc fonte derivata clades,—

so that the only chance for Christendom was in a general reformation of the Church both in the head and members.

'It will soon be said,' says Cardinal Julian, 'that the clergy are incorrigible, and will apply no remedy to their own disorders. When they no longer have any hopes of amendment, they will fall upon us. The minds of men are pregnant with expectation of what measures will be adopted, and ready for the birth of something tragic. The rancour they have imbibed against us becomes manifest. They will soon think it an agreeable sacrifice to God to abuse and rob ecclesiastics as abandoned to extreme disorders, and hateful to God and man. The little respect now remaining for the ecclesiastical orders will be soon extinguished. Men will cast the blame of these abuses on the Court of Rome, which will be considered the cause of them, because it had neglected to apply the necessary remedy. I see the axe is at the root. The tree begins to bend, and instead of propping it whilst in our power, we accelerate its fall. Bodies and souls will perish together. God hides from us the prospect of our dangers, as He is accustomed to do with those whom He destines for punishment. We run into the fire which we see lighted before us.'[1]

How little, indeed, the Roman Court could be expected to check the disorders which had become general throughout Christendom, will appear most evidently by looking at a particular instance.

Of the three rivals who claimed possession of the Papal chair, the one who actually held Rome, the only one whose pretensions were very considerable, was John XXIII. Let us hear the latest Church historian's account of him, and then ask ourselves what was the state of the hierarchy when such a man could maintain even for a day, I do not say the Popedom, but any high position in the Church?

---

[1] These sentences have been gathered from the former of the two Epistles of Cardinal Julian, the Papal Legate in Germany, in which he dissuades Pope Eugenius IV. from dissolving the Council of Basil. See 'Epist. Juliani Cardinalis ad Eugenium IV. Pont. Rom.' apud Orthuini Gratii *Fascic. Rer. expetend. ac fugiend.*, fol. lxxix. seqq. Colon. 1535.—EDITORS.

'Balthasar Cossa was a Neapolitan of noble birth;[2] as a simple clerk he served in the piratical warfare carried on by the hostile fleets of the rival Provençal and Hungarian kings of Naples. He retained through life the pirates' habit of sleeping by day and waking by night. At a later period two of his brothers, who had not like himself abandoned in time that perilous vocation, were taken by King Ladislaus, and notwithstanding the influence of Balthasar with the Pope, and the Pope's strenuous exertions in their favour, hanged without mercy. Balthasar cherished from that time an implacable hatred to Ladislaus. He retired to Bologna and studied the canon law, it was said without much success. He was raised by Boniface IX. to the dignity of Archdeacon of Bologna. But his ambition had higher views. He returned to Rome, and was appointed one of the Pope's chamberlains. He became one of the dexterous and unscrupulous agents of the Pope's insatiable avarice and of his own. He was the most daring and skilful vendor of preferments, the most artful of usurers. By secret . . . . messengers he warned rich prelates that the Pope, ill-disposed towards them, designed to remove them from their wealthy and peaceful benefices to preferments in barbarous countries, in remote islands, or lands held by the Saracens. He received vast bribes to propitiate the unfriendly Pontiff. To him was attributed the enormous abuse of Indulgences. Already priests and friars, loaded with these lucrative commodities, travelled through Germany, by Thuringia, Swabia, Saxony, into the Northern kingdoms, Denmark and Sweden. On their arrival in a city they exhibited a banner with the Papal arms, the keys of St. Peter, from the windows of their inn. They entered the principal church, took their seat before the altar, the floor strewed with rich carpets, and under awnings of silk, ... exhibited to the wondering people, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Bishops or Priests, their precious wares. "I have heard them," writes the biographer of John XXIII.,

---

[2] 'De Vitâ Joannis XXIII., à Theodoric à Niem, apud Meibomium, i.'

"declare that St. Peter himself had not greater power to remit sins than themselves." One of the wealthiest of these Papal merchants, on his return from his journey, was seized at Bologna. Balthasar Cossa, perhaps his former patron, but now Legate, plundered him of 100,000 florins. The poor victim hanged himself in prison. Pope Boniface had formed so high an opinion of the abilities of Balthasar Cossa, that he was raised to the Cardinalate, and appointed Legate to wrest the city of Bologna from the domination of the Visconti. The Legate fulfilled his mission; the poor student of law, the Archdeacon of Bologna, became the lord of that city with as absolute and unlimited dominion as the tyrant of any other of the Lombard or Romagnese commonwealths. Balthasar Cossa, if hardly surpassed in cruelty and extortion by the famous Eccelino, by his debaucheries might have put to shame the most shameless of the Viscontis. Under his iron rule day after day such multitudes of both sexes, strangers as well as Bolognese, were put to death on charges of treason, sedition, or other crimes, that the population of Bologna seemed dwindling down to that of a small city. He used to send to the executioners to despatch their victims with greater celerity. Neither person nor possession was exempt from his remorseless taxation. Grain could not be ground, nor bread made, nor wine sold without his licence. From all ranks, from the noble to the peasant, he exacted the most laborious services. He laid taxes on prostitutes, gaming-houses, usurers. His licentiousness was even more wide and promiscuous. Two hundred maids, wives, and widows, with many nuns, are set down as the victims of his lust. Many were put to death by their jealous husbands and indignant kindred. The historian' (he is the Pope's own secretary) 'wonders that in so rich and populous a city no husband's, or father's, or brother's dagger found its way to the heart of the tyrant.'[3]

Such was the man whom the horror-stricken populace called commonly the Devil Incarnate, that was chosen Pope in the fifteenth century to fill the chair of Gregory VII.;

---

[3] Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. vi. pp. 80-82.—EDITORS.

whom it was necessary to invoke the aid of the Emperor and a General Council to dethrone, and who finally escaped any greater punishment than the loss of the tiara and a temporary imprisonment, and who died a Cardinal and Prince of the Church.

It is not strange that, appalled by such revolting spectacles as these, the reforming party in the Church should look to other quarters besides the Papal chair for the necessary means of restoring discipline in the Church. And it may be said that at the Council of Constance the two reforming theories to which these excesses gave birth met each other face to face in the persons of Gerson and John Huss, the one upon the seat of judgment, the other at the prisoner's bar.

The theory of Gerson, the prevailing one at that great Synod, professed to fall back upon the aristocratic element in the Church. It retained all the characteristic parts of the established hierarchical system of Europe. The visible Church, with all its ranks and orders and wealth and dignity, was, according to this view, however fallen, still the spouse of Christ, the rich depositary of all spiritual grace, which was administered by its officers, and by them alone, however unworthy. It was still indefeasibly the temple of God, only requiring to be purified. And it was to be purified by the regular and constitutional agency of its proper and legal functionaries. The mistake had been in conceding a sole autocratical power to the Pope. A Pope was indeed necessary. He was a part of the constitution of the Church—its first elective, single, magistrate. But he was subject and responsible to that which represented the whole powers of the Catholic Church, a General Council. Councils must meet and know their privileges. They must not be, as they have been too long, the mere humble advisers of the sovereign Pontiff; but themselves the free supreme Legislature, entitled to control and, if need be, punish and dethrone Popes themselves. Gerson's twelve famous maxims go to the root of the matter. In these he maintans that Jesus Christ Himself is the one primal and perfect Head of the Church, the Pope

being Head only in a secondary sense; that the union of Christ with the Church was alone indissoluble—that of the Pope capable of being dissolved; that the office of a Pope is necessary to complete the Church, but any particular Pope may be removed; that the Church, or an Œcumenic Council representing the Church, is under the direction of the Holy Ghost; that it may enact canons which the Pope is bound to obey and cannot annul; that a Council may be assembled in some cases without the authority of even a legitimate Pope; and can command the cession of a Pope for the welfare of the Church or the termination of a schism; that with it rests ultimately the reformation of the Church both in faith and discipline; and that Councils should be held from time to time, as the one supreme irrefragable representative of the Church.[4]

Far different and more bold was the view which what may be called the popular reformers advocated. The spiritual Franciscans, the Wickliffites, and Huss, shocked at the spectacle of worldliness that everywhere met their eyes, and unable to reconcile it with their ideas of the Church of God, fell back upon the conception of the Church of the Elect. The visible Church and its worldly hierarchy they declared no longer formed even a portion of the true Church. Those only were Christ's members who in respect of genuine holiness imitated Christ, and were actuated by his spirit. He only was the Vicar of Christ who acted according to that character; he only a true Pastor who fed the flock; those only who really obeyed Christ were Christians. No one who was not a Christian could be a Christian priest, or administer Christian sacraments, or exercise any privilege of a Christian Church. From the mass of the worldly clergy, Popes, Prelates, Priests or Doctors, they could look for no reformation. The Holy Spirit had been despised. He had left them. His abode was only in his elect.

---

[4] Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. vi. pp. 190–1. The various Maxims, Articles, and Theses proposed by Gerson will be found at full length in Bzovius, *Ann.* ad an. 1415.—EDITORS.

And such being plainly their view, I cannot but be surprised at the embarrassment which some of the most respectable Protestant historians seem to feel in discovering even a specious reason for the condemnation of Huss as a heretic. 'It may be affirmed with truth,' says Mosheim, 'that Huss's religious opinions, at least in matters of moment and importance, were conformable to the established doctrines of his age. He declaimed, indeed, with extraordinary vehemence against the Roman Pontiffs, the Bishops and Monks; but this freedom was looked upon as lawful in those times, and it was used every day in the Council of Constance, where the tyranny of the Court of Rome, and the corruption of the sacerdotal and monastic orders, were censured with the utmost severity. . . . Many learned men have endeavoured to investigate the reasons that occasioned the pronouncing of the sentence against Huss and his associate, and, as no adequate grounds for such severe proceedings can be found either in the life or opinions of that good man, they conclude that he fell a victim to the rage and injustice of his unrelenting enemies. And indeed this conclusion is both natural and well-grounded,' &c.[5] To much the same effect Dean Milman, after observing that no case was made in the charge against Huss of denying Transubstantiation, and that his denunciations of the vices of the clergy could hardly have surpassed those uttered by his judges, Gerson and Peter D'Ailly, goes on to say—'It is difficult to define or apprehend the precise remaining delinquencies or errors of which he was found guilty.' I really cannot see the difficulty. I readily admit that upon most points of doctrine John Huss was orthodox enough in the sense of that age. He believed in Transubstantiation. He never asserted the necessity of Communion in both kinds. He held the invocation of Saints, the worship of Images (at least in the same sense as Gerson himself), the necessity of Confession, the merit of Good Works, and the Seven Sacraments. His denunciations of the vices of the clergy were not more passionate than those of his judges; though there was this, and it is no small difference

---

[5] Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.*, Cent. XV., pt. ii., ch. ii., sect. 7.—EDITORS.

between them, that the remonstrances of Gerson and D'Ailly were addressed to the clergy themselves, to the regular constitutional authorities; those of Huss to the ignorant vulgar and the temporal prince. 'Certainly,' said the Cardinal of Florence,[6] 'you have kept no measures in your sermons and writings. Was it not your duty to adapt your discourses to the circumstances of your hearers? Was it necessary to preach against the Cardinals before the people? It had been much better to say all these things to the Cardinals themselves than before the laity, to the great scandal of everybody.'

But the grand point, the fundamental point, was this—that he held a theory of the Church which subverted the very foundations of the hierarchy. Let us only attend to the extracts from Huss's writings that were read at that Council, and we shall perceive, I think, that there is no such great difficulty in apprehending or defining the errors for which he was condemned. Let us take Article X. 'If he who calls himself the Vicar of Christ walks in the paths of virtue, we believe that he is truly the Vicar of Christ and the chief Pontiff of the Church he governs. But if he takes another course he is the messenger of Antichrist, and contrary to St. Peter and Christ himself. . . . . If the Pope does not live as St. Peter did, if he is covetous, he is the Vicar of Judas Iscariot, who loved the reward of iniquity by selling his Master . . . . The power of the Pope as Vicar of Jesus Christ is void, unless he be like Christ and St. Peter in his life and conversation. . . . . The Cardinals are not the manifest and true successors of the College of Apostles if they do not live like the Apostles. . . . . The Church ought to consist of three bodies—priests who observe the law of Christ, nobles who must cause that law to be observed, and people who must serve the two former. There are three sorts of obedience—a spiritual obedience due to the law of God, a secular obedience due to the civil laws, and an ecclesiastical obedience which is an invention of the priests without any express authority from the Scrip-

---

[6] Zabarella.

tures.' 'If a Pope, a Bishop, or a Prelate is in mortal sin, he is neither a Pope, a Bishop, nor a Prelate. The grace of predestination is the bond by which the body of the Church, and every member, are inseparably joined to its Head. And if the Pope be a wicked man, he is so far from being Head of the Church, that he is not even a member of it. There is no place of dignity, nor any human election, nor any sensible mark that makes a man a member of the Holy Catholic Church.'

One would think that in such Articles as these one might see matter enough for burning a dozen heretics. In effect, however, there is, I think, reason to believe that the Council had not the least doubt that Huss's real heresies went further than their legal evidence would enable them to prove. Nor were they altogether mistaken. There was a writing of his then in existence, though not in their hands, which would have materially strengthened the case against him—I mean his 'Anatomy of Antichrist,' and his private letters written during the progress of his trial.

I do not think it necessary, therefore, in order to account for his sentence, to have recourse with Mosheim to the old quarrel between the Realists and the Nominalists. It is quite true, as he alleges, that Huss had incurred the hatred of the Nominalists by his persecution of them in the University of Prague. It is true that they afterwards gloried in his defeat by their great doctors, Gerson and Peter D'Ailly; and it is true also that, at one stage of the proceedings, some traces of this old Scholastic feud make their appearance in an attempt by the Cardinal of Cambray to prove that a denial of Transubstantiation was a logical consequence of the doctrine of the Realists. But I think it is to overlook what is manifest and before our eyes for the sake of what is remote and obscure, to trace the condemnation of Huss to these logical subtleties; and we see a sufficient reason for it in the very propositions which the Council itself selected as the ground of its sentence. It is true that Huss gave oral explanations of many of them, which if admitted would have considerably mitigated their meaning; but in some cases these oral glosses were quite

irreconcilable with the text, and he steadily refused to retract his most obnoxious statements. He declared himself indeed open to conviction and ready and anxious to receive further instruction; but it is manifest that, if the principle of punishing heretics be admitted at all, there must be some limit to instruction—otherwise a heretic, by continually renewing the dispute and demanding more and more, [might indefinitely postpone the final decision].

FOURTH COURSE

The English Reformation

LECTURE I.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION—ITS ORIGIN, AND CAUSES OF THE SUBSEQUENT CHECK TO ITS PROGRESS.

GENTLEMEN,—I cannot but feel that, in the present course of lectures, I shall labour under peculiar difficulties, and have, therefore, special grounds for bespeaking your charitable forbearance. I have undertaken, during the present term, to carry out and complete a plan of which I know nothing but the mere outline, and to finish, with small time for preparation, the maturely considered and leisurely executed work of a distinguished master in his art.[1]

When a modern sculptor undertakes to complete some mutilated piece of ancient statuary, the attempt is generally thought to show more boldness than discretion. But my attempt may seem still more rash. It is as if a Birmingham contractor were to engage to finish an antique bronze upon receipt of the measurements, without ever having seen the work which his labours are intended to complete.

In my case, however, I can only trust that the necessity of the work I have undertaken will plead my excuse for any faults in the execution of it; and as it is a task which hardly anyone could perform quite successfully except by singular good fortune, I shall have the less cause to be ashamed if I do but poorly, what nobody could be expected to do altogether well.

Dispensing then with any further apologies, let me briefly explain to you the plan which I intend to follow. My subject will be the English Reformation of the sixteenth century, and

---

[1] Dr. Samuel Butcher, afterwards Bishop of Meath, having been appointed Regius Professor in 1853, asked Dr. FitzGerald to undertake this course for him. This he did, though not yet himself appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

its progress and impediments traced, if we have time to trace them so far, to the period of our happy Revolution in 1688.

In dealing with this extensive subject, I shall not attempt anything like a regular narrative of the events which filled the long interval I have marked out. The quantity of time that can be allotted to these lectures would afford no opportunity of doing this, except in a merely superficial manner. And even such a brief and superficial outline, as our time would allow, would be necessarily presented to you from this place under most disadvantageous circumstances. You would, with such a method, be dragged here twice a week to listen, for an hour each day, to a meagre detail of facts which most of you were previously familiar with, and which all might make themselves familiar with in one quarter of the time, by reading for themselves any ordinary manual of English history. Prelections constructed upon such a plan as I have referred to were suitable to ages and countries wherein books were scarce and dear. Under such circumstances oral instruction was indispensable, the school became the study, and the lecture was slowly enunciated so as to give the hearer time to commit each sentence to paper as it fell from the lips of the professor. But such a method under our circumstances would be a grievous waste both of my time and of yours. Your attending here at all is a proof that you take some interest in the subject, and the press affords to all, who really wish for information, facilities of obtaining it far greater than can be offered from the professor's chair. Instead, therefore, of attempting anything like a regular detail of the facts of the history of the English Reformation, I shall rather make it my business to remark on and criticise those facts, to place such of them as have been commonly mistaken in what seems to me their true point of view, and bring out, in the shape of general results, whatever they appear to contribute most observable to a knowledge of the character and spirit of the times in which they took place. It is the criticism and philosophy of history which, in my opinion, form the proper province of a professor in his public lectures, which are then

most really useful when they are made to stimulate, to guide, and to assist the hearer in the prosecution of his private studies.

The English Reformation is to be considered as a part of the great religious movement of the sixteenth century; and, in so considering it, we must be careful to distinguish in our minds those characteristics which belonged to it in common with that movement in general, from those which were peculiarly its own. In common with the Reformation in other countries at the same time, it was a great movement to restore the primitive purity of faith and practice, proceeding out of the bosom of the unreformed Church itself. It was, like the Reformations of Germany and Switzerland, the result of one of those grand conjunctures of circumstances, recurring at very long intervals, which predispose the minds of whole nations together in a particular direction, but of which the intense and almost magical force seldom outlasts a brief period in the world's history. This is a view of the Reformation generally to which I desire especially to direct your attention, as it will, I think, enable you easily to correct many erroneous, and some dangerous views, at present popular upon the subject.

It is a great mistake, as I conceive, to think of the progressive improvement of the human race as something which kept advancing with a continually accelerated, or even an equable pace. There are, perhaps, some appearances to justify such an idea in the case of the strictly demonstrative or experimental sciences and the mechanic arts. These have this singular advantage, that so much as is once gained in them is gained for ever. No one even ever hoped to make a figure in these happy departments of human knowledge, without thoroughly mastering what the labours of his predecessors have added to the general sum, and what has been once proved cannot be understood without being assented to. But even in these, while nothing is ever lost, there are long periods wherein little is gained. Circumstances draw off men's attention from them entirely, or divert it to some baffling difficulty

which long exercises in fruitless efforts the wit of many succeeding generations. While, on the contrary, at other times, the sudden discovery of some fruitful or luciferous principle enables a single generation to pass as it were with a bound over a greater space than their forefathers had traversed in many ages, or than their descendants will traverse in as many more. But we may waive any anxious discussion of this part of the subject for the present. It is not with the demonstrative or experimental sciences I am at present concerned, but with the progress of mankind in respect of religion, morals, and politics. Now, in respect of these also, I do earnestly believe that the human race as a whole is making progress. But that progress, so far as it can be counted upon as a steady one, is surely very slow, and its ordinary current, when sought at any one time, hardly perceptible. It is at special epochs that its slowly accumulated forces seem to swell as it were into a flood tide which sweeps at once over the barriers that had so long retarded it, and covers whole acres in one deluge with its advancing wave. But not all, not nearly all that it thus covers, is permanently won. The forces which propelled it soon begin to fail. The wave recedes again, and recedes rapidly, not for the most part indeed to its ancient limits, but often very near them, and for ages together nothing more may be gained till another happy spring-tide again occurs.

For you will observe that when we speak of human progress in morals and religion, we speak not of knowledge advancing to new discoveries in moral or religious matters. Indeed no such discoveries remain to be made. But we speak of the recognition and diffusion of old truth ; and truth, in moral and religious matters, requires for its recognition and diffusion, not merely that it should be attended to, but that it should be favourably attended to.

Now this favourable attention is of two kinds. One is a predisposition in favour of truth simply as truth, or in other words, candour and ingenuousness of mind. The love of truth as such is the natural predisposition which acts upon

the human race steadily in its favour. But in respect of all mankind, this must be allowed to be a comparatively small and slowly acting force. It is by this, indeed, that the cause of truth is permanently maintained, and by this, I am convinced, in the end her triumph will be finally established. But those who are thus 'of the truth' have long been, and I fear will long continue, a 'little flock' and a poor minority.

But apart from pure regard to truth as such, and for its own sake, the circumstances of a particular age may suddenly dispose large numbers of men in favour of particular truths, may strip off prejudices and predilections which long obstructed the reception of those truths; and thus, by the introduction of some new force quite different from the mere weight of reason and evidence, remove some ancient barrier which had for ages broken and repressed the advancing current of improvement in some particular direction.

Now, suppose that a person, struck with the great progress made in such a singular era as we have been describing, were to assume that all the mighty effects produced should be set down to the account of the machinery directly employed for the purpose of producing them by the friends of truth at that particular juncture, he would plainly fall into an error, and an error that might be attended with very mischievous practical consequences. He would naturally conclude that it required nothing but a restoration of the same machinery to produce the same effects; and if he were a man of an ardent and enthusiastic temperament, he might easily be led on to come forth himself as a second Luther, imitating the tone and manner, repeating the arguments and the declamation of the bold reformer, as Don Quixote imitated Belianis of Greece or Amadis of Gaul, and expecting, like the Monk of Wittenberg, to shake whole nations with the thunder of his eloquence. I have compared such conduct to that of Don Quixote, and in doing so I did not mean merely to amuse you by a ludicrous comparison, but I chose the Don's case as one of the best illustrations I could think of. For wherein consisted the folly of the crazy knight of the rueful countenance? Not at all

so much in admiring the chivalry of the ancient Paladins; upon this point you will observe that in reasoning with his friends he has always a great deal to say, and generally much the better of the argument. But it lay in the assumption that the state of things was the same in his time as it had been in the days of the knight-errants, and that because their expeditions were honourable and useful in their own age, similar expeditions must needs be honourable and useful in an age so different from theirs. Cast him in what age you will, and Luther would always have been a great mind, and within a larger or a narrower circle, according to circumstances, a remarkable man. But except for the predisposing causes which in the sixteenth century acted upon his auditory, he could not have produced the effects he did, which are due not merely to his arguments or his eloquence—to the weight of his matter or the energy of his manner—but to these operating upon an already prepared subject of their operation. He was a firebrand falling upon a mass of timber, which soon kindles a conflagration a thousand times greater than its own blaze. Had he fallen upon a marble floor, he would have exhibited nothing but his own solitary flame. The propitious hour, in short, may often pass off without effect; and the man is comparatively powerless when he comes not in the propitious hour. It is the conjuncture of the hour and the man which produces such wonderful effects as we trace in the history of the Reformation; and it would be a great miscalculation to suppose that at a different hour the same means would retain their magical efficacy. Hasty reasoners are sometimes apt to imagine that the decay of the Reformation movement arose from the disuse of the aggressive machinery by which it was at first carried on, whereas I believe that a more attentive examination would show that in many cases that machinery was abandoned from finding that it had lost its power.

It is important, then, to bear in mind that in all such great movements as we have been speaking of, a great part, a very great part of their apparent success is not due to the mere force of truth taken by itself, or to the manner in which that

force is applied, but to predisposing causes acting at that particular juncture, such as, for example, some special disgust at an overgrown superstition, some special dislike to a domineering priesthood, and so forth, and which may not act again with the same efficacy for as many ages after, as they have lain dormant for ages before. In all such movements the number of adherents is at first swelled by the mere mob of restless spirits, the 'novarum rerum avidi,' who would have gone with equal readiness into any plausible novelty which might have happened to have struck, at such a season, the prevailing temper of the times. It was, you may rely upon it, to a very great extent, just the same sort of persons who were carried off by the Reformation under Luther and Calvin, and by the counter-Reformation under Loyola and Philip Neri, by what was called the Evangelical movement in the close of the last century, and by the Tract movement a few years ago; and just the same persons, who are wandering about the kingdom with cold feet and hot heads as Passionists and Redemptorists at present, would have been preaching on Kennington Common amid a shower of mud and turnip-tops in the days of Whitefield's popularity.

But besides this volatile swarm who are drawn like insects to the greatest glare and loudest noise, there will be in such movements many more of much greater solidity of character and soundness of judgment, who really do assent to the new doctrines upon rational conviction, but whose minds would never have been opened to that conviction,—to the careful investigation of the grounds of it, but for some accidental circumstance, distinct from the love of truth, which made them willing to inquire, and disposed to receive the conclusion to which inquiry would naturally lead. Since, therefore, the success of such a movement depends so largely upon causes different from the intrinsic worth and value of its principles, neither on the one hand can the truth of those principles be taken as a measure of its success, nor on the other can that truth be reasonably questioned on account of any falling off or after-decay of its success.

These reflections, if I am not much mistaken, will help us to at least the partial solution of a problem which Mr. Macaulay has proposed in a very brilliant essay with which you are doubtless familiar, and which appeared originally in the shape of a review of Ranke's 'History of the Popes.' The problem I speak of is, to find the reason why no Christian nation, which did not adopt the principles of the Reformation before the end of the sixteenth century, should ever have adopted them?—why, while Roman Catholic communities have since that time become infidel, and become Roman Catholic again, none has become Protestant?

What his own solution of this problem may be, or whether he has any, it would be impertinent to inquire; but I think it is not too much to say that the impression most likely to be produced upon the reader of his essay, from the topics principally dwelt on, and the mode of presenting them, would be that the conclusion strongly suggested by it is that Protestantism has in itself scarcely any peculiar element of positive strength, and that all its power is that negative power which it has in common with infidelity; that, in short, to a thinking mind, apart from the influences of custom and education, there is no medium between an unreasoning faith and a reasoning infidelity, and that from one to the other of these the mind of man must be expected to oscillate continually. This, at any rate, whether designedly suggested by Mr. Macaulay or not, is a notion very popular at the present time, and one which is carefully fostered with equal solicitude by the patrons of scepticism and of credulity; and for this reason, if for no other, it seems desirable to direct your thoughts to the subject, and to point out to you that the phenomena of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, compared with its after-history, afford no solid ground for any such conclusion from them. The semblance of such a ground can only be laid by an over-estimate of what the mere force of truth and reason is likely to effect; and I think experience sufficiently shows that such a force is not at all likely to effect more than has been effected in the case of the Reformation,

but that, on the contrary, supposing its principles ever so sound and true, it was to have been expected that a great part of their success should be carried to the account of other causes which we know to be in their nature variable. All this will probably appear more distinctly if we descend from generals to particulars.

One special circumstance, then, in which the progress of the Reformation at first differed from that of its after-history, was that the Reformation at first was a movement within the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church itself, but that afterwards it assumed the shape of a warfare waged against it from without by separate organised societies.

Now if we reflect upon the origin and character of that movement from within, we shall see no reason for being surprised that it should have spent its force so soon, or that a similar movement on a large scale has never since occurred again.

Romanism is a system which in its specific form holds in a wonderful state of fusion and commixture the elements of Christian truth, and of what is substantially paganism, or the religion of corrupt human nature. It is in the blending of these two that its peculiar character and peculiar strength lies, and it is this which gives Romanism that incalculable advantage which it possesses over all the purely pagan religions. It has, as it were, borrowed a spark from heaven itself to animate the carcase of exhausted heathenism. By means of this it has secured for itself the possibility of an earnestness of faith in thinking minds, the want of which was the great and incurable defect of paganism. Romanism has always hitherto succeeded in so shaping all the positive dogmatic statements of the doctrines to which it is pledged, as to save itself from any open and flagrant contradiction of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It has been hitherto always possible for a mind, already prejudiced in favour of the Roman Catholic Church, plausibly to represent that Church to itself as continuing on the tradition of the Apostles, and, though possibly developing from age to age more than was

distinctly stated at the first, yet still retaining as a groundwork the original ideas of revelation, and never breaking its connection with the Apostolic Church by any rejection of the foundation then laid. And, as long as this state of things continues, the Romish system has certainly wonderful advantages, working its roots into every soil by the forces at once of truth and falsehood. But meanwhile it has great dangers also. For the cultivation of a really Christian spirit in its members must needs tend to make them dissatisfied with the pagan element of their religion; and the pagan element on the other hand is constantly tending to obliterate all vestiges not only of Christianity, but of everything rational in the system. Neither can be quite satisfied without expelling the other. 'These are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.'

The Romish system, therefore, notwithstanding all its advantages, carries in itself the seeds of its own decay; it tends to destruction in two possible ways:—either (1) by the Christian element being so confounded with the pagan that thinking minds reject both together in the lump; or (2) by the Christian element throwing off its pagan incumbrance. The second of these was the case at the Reformation, and the question is why it has never occurred again on a large scale. To this it might be sufficient to reply that anyone who reflects how many ages elapsed before such a movement on a great scale took place at all, will be led to form such an estimate of the time to be allowed for the production of such great moral revolutions, as not to be surprised that a movement of that kind does not happen every couple of centuries in the world's history. But we may, as I said, give a more special answer.

It may seem a paradox, but it is, I am convinced, a truth, that the Reformation of the sixteenth century saved the Roman Catholic Church from almost total destruction. The great peril of the Romish system is, I conceive, that of being wholly swallowed up by its pagan element, the consequence, and the not remote consequence, of which again must be general infidelity among its members. And the hour of strength to

the pagan element is the hour of that Church's triumph and security. Now such an hour was the age just preceding the Reformation; and all historical evidence goes to show that the consequence of the almost avowed heathenism, which was then spreading over Europe, was a rapidly increasing infidelity in the higher and better instructed order of minds. A well-conducted attack upon Christianity through the sides of the popular religion might have antedated by two centuries the phenomena of the first French Revolution, and indeed something far worse. But the Divine Providence ordered it otherwise; God in his mercy delayed to send the deluge upon Europe till He had prepared an ark of refuge. A movement of some kind was inevitable, but it took a more favourable direction than could have been expected. The Reformers did not appeal to mere reason against the absurdities of Romanism, but to the law and to the testimony. They called the attention of the popular mind to the Christian element which still lingered in the popular religion. They presented to men not the option of Romanism or Infidelity, but of Romanism or the Gospel; and they thus forced upon the Church of Rome itself the necessity of a religious revival within its own precincts. Rome learned from the Reformation that it could not without imminent danger lose the semblance of a Christian Church, or suffer its doctrines and practices to degenerate into a mere form of pagan superstition.

The Reformation, too, came at first in such a form as not too rudely to shake the very foundation-stones of popular belief—attachment to the great continuous body which filled in the eyes of Europeans the place of the Catholic Church, i.e. the great organised corporation of the Western Church. At first no man looked to the breaking up of this body. It was fully expected that that great body itself needed only a call to reformation, and would spontaneously in a few years throw off the errors which had defiled its creed, and the yoke of tyranny which had crushed its liberties. But when the miscalculation of these hopes was discovered, when the Council of Trent made it evident that though the Church was pre-

[illegible]

pared to go a certain length in remedying abuses, and in giving a rational form to doctrine, it was as sternly as ever resolved not to go the same length as the Reformers; and when the active spirits of the counter-Reformation still more changed the scene, when the Roman Church was no longer found relying merely upon her worldly splendour and worldly power, but diligent in all the same earnest efforts as had characterised the Reformers; resolute and courageous, subtle and learned in controversy; her pulpits filled with eloquent and unwearied preachers, her schools with catechists; her monasteries, not with lazy drones, but pious and active monks of the new and more practical orders—then things began to wear a different aspect. The predisposing causes which had made men disgusted with Romanism were thus in a great measure removed; and the Reformation had, on the other side, acquired a semblance of schism which it did not wear at first, and which doubtless repelled multitudes who, but for this, would have readily embraced it.

Meanwhile, however, the success of the counter-Reformation prepared the way for another change in Romanism. Her hour of triumph is always, as I said before, her hour of weakness. Her spiritual energies relaxed with prosperity. The earnest, self-devoting Jesuit of the first days of Loyola and Lainez changed into the sleek and wily politician who 'made things easy,' both in doctrine and practice, to those who would compound for sin by lending their wealth or power to the worldly interests of the Church—the Père Tout-à-Tout, so pleasantly pictured by Voltaire. The clergy lost once the respect of all classes, and with the clergy the religion also sank. It is not strange, then, that in the next grand conjuncture of circumstances, an infidel movement should have taken its turn. But there were two special reasons besides for such an occurrence. The first was that the infidel movement of the eighteenth century was preceded by an abortive Christian movement from within the Roman Catholic Church. I mean Jansenism, which might, like the German Reformation, have been the salvation of Europe, but for two circumstances.

One was that, France being then one great united monarchy, and not, like Germany, a congeries of little independent states, the facilities for crushing Jansenism with a strong hand were far greater than those for crushing the Lutheran Reformation. The chance in favour of Jansenism, in its very cradle, was the single one of its obtaining the favour of a single prince. The chances for Lutheranism were the chances of its gaining patronage from any one of many princes, whose characters were various and whose interests were divided.

Another circumstance adverse to the success of the Jansenist movement was that, even in order to maintain its own character, it was thrown into a fierce antagonism to the Protestant Church. Its dogmatic resemblance to Calvinism in its distinctive peculiarities could not be glossed over; and to compensate for this, its adherents were strongly tempted to even an exaggerated display of enthusiasm in behalf of other points in which they agreed with the great body of Roman Catholics. A body appealing freely for its own purposes to reason and Scripture, and yet zealous for the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the miraculous sanctity of the Holy Thorn; a body which maintained with unflinching pertinacity the necessary outward oneness of organisation in the Catholic Church, under the chair of Peter, and yet was openly at variance with the chair of Peter and separated visibly from the communion of the Western Church, wore an aspect of inconsistency which did not much recommend it to thinking minds; and thus, weak within and powerfully assailed from without, it is no wonder that it should have failed to present any strong barrier to the springtide of infidelity that was then recovering from its temporary check. The Protestant Churches, too, were themselves at that time suffering from the inroads of the same evil. It is indeed, in my opinion, a gross calumny to say that infidelity is the legitimate development of Protestantism; but it must be allowed that it is one natural excess of Protestantism, and that therefore Protestantism has, in one sense, a tendency to run into infidelity; just as everything, however good, has, in this imperfect world of ours, a tendency

to run into extremes. It is no more surprising, surely, that free inquiry, once set on work in religion, should have pushed itself too far, than that free inquiry in philosophy should have passed into like excesses. And as no sensible man would agree that wholesale and contemptuous rejection of what are called 'popular superstitions' in physical science is a legitimate development of the inductive philosophy of Lord Bacon, so no sensible man should argue that infidelity is the legitimate development of the religion of Protestants. We have discovered lately that many of the popular notions, which our immediate predecessors set down summarily as vulgar errors, were substantially true; but it was quite natural that they should have been hastily rejected in the mass when mixed with so much of what was certainly false, and that philosophers should have been in too great a hurry to round their systems by expunging all the phenomena they were unable to account for. Let us allow for a tendency to similar excesses in religious matters, and Protestantism will be in no danger of being convicted of radical infidelity because her spirit of free inquiry is liable to similar abuses. Excesses like these must be expected, by anyone acquainted with human nature, to disfigure from time to time any creed however just and true; and therefore the actual recurrence of them cannot be fairly treated as a proof of its unsoundness. It is nothing short of ignorant impatience which leads men to expect that the permanent establishment of faith in the exact truth can be reached except through such disturbances as these, and consequently to apprehend that all is lost when such disturbances arise.

> Fond impious man! think'st thou yon sanguine cloud,
> Raised by thy breath, hath quenched the orb of day?
> To-morrow he repairs his golden flood,
> And warms the nations with a brighter ray.

Now, at the time of which we are speaking, a cloud of this kind had obscured the light of Protestantism in the Churches of the Reformation, though it had not extinguished that

light. And this circumstance had been artfully laid hold of by the Roman Catholic Church to produce the impression that Protestants were really infidels. What wonder then that the people took them at their word, and seeing no alternative but Romanism or Infidelity, chose the latter?

But infidelity is a creed, or rather the absence of a creed, in which the human mind cannot long acquiesce. And a Roman Catholic revival was the ultimate consequence, for which again a fortunate conjuncture of circumstances prepared the way. For infidelity is always more or less attended by a reaction towards implicit faith; so that, as the infidel movement was synchronous in the Roman Catholic and Protestant bodies, the reactionary movement was synchronous also.

There is, therefore, nothing in the phenomena which Mr. Macaulay has exhibited which need surprise any sound Protestant who has learnt from history the ordinary laws which regulate human affairs—nothing which need shake his faith in the truth of Protestantism or in the certainty of its ultimate triumph. The pendulum will swing long to and fro, before it settles in the middle.

We are just now, I am persuaded, entering upon a state of things which will—if some unexpected accident does not suddenly alter the course of events—try more than any previous one the strength of the Romish system. The Roman Church is just now exhibiting a strong disposition to win a transitory triumph by casting away all her best elements of permanence. She is centralising herself to a degree unheard of since the days of Hildebrand. She is drawing all her powers into the single person of a not over-wise Pontiff, who sits upon an uneasy throne, and grasps a sceptre which an adverse chance may in a moment wrest from his hands. She seems resolved to set her life upon a die, and to stand the hazard of the cast. And she is at the same time even ostentatiously reviving whatever in her system most disgusted sober minds in former ages. She seems almost to glory in the making her religion conspicuously unlike the religion of the

New Testament and the Primitive Church; and she is every day more and more throwing herself upon the forces which she draws from her pagan element. I cannot but think that in thus acting she is squandering her life-blood; and that any temporary success acquired by such a prodigal expenditure of strength will be in the end very dearly purchased. For whenever real Christianity has been quite expelled from that Church, you may rely upon it that her days are numbered. Whenever God's elect shall have finally quitted Babylon, you may be sure that the hour of her final destruction has arrived.

LECTURE II.

WICKLIFFE.

Gentlemen,—In looking for the predisposing causes which produced the great movement of the English Reformation of the sixteenth century, one's eye is naturally first directed to its great immediate predecessor—the Wickliffite or Lollard movement of the fourteenth century.

It cannot, however, be expected that I should undertake to give you anything like a full criticism upon the history of that most interesting movement. In truth, the materials for such a criticism are not yet before the public; and though we are deeply indebted to the labours of those who have turned their attention to this subject—among whom the name of our own learned librarian, Dr. Todd, is specially to be mentioned—it is still to be regretted that so much obscurity hangs over the very sources of information in this department. I cannot say that the latest historian of the Reformation, the lively Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, has done much to clear up this obscurity. Indeed I believe even his greatest admirers would hardly contend that careful research and rigorous impartiality of judgment are his most conspicuous merits. He seems to aim at producing rather a series of brilliant tableaux of the most striking scenes in the history of the Reformation, than a regular narrative of its course. And he is apt to drop entirely whatever is to ordinary readers of a dull and commonplace character; 'Quæ desperat tractata nitescere posse, relinquit.'

What the effect of this exciting style, as it may be called, of writing history upon others may be I know not; but I confess that when it is continued through five bulky volumes

it becomes to me far more tedious than the unadorned simplicity of Collier, or even the colloquial garrulity of Burnet. There is to me something very wearisome in convulsive efforts, repeated chapter after chapter, in a long work, to excite the reader's interest and arouse his wonder, and make a grave narrative of real facts produce all the mental intoxication of a novel. All this may be well enough in a short piece; but when it is continued too long and repeated too often, attention to the entertainment flags, and, as in a protracted pantomime, we begin to think rather of the machinery than of its results, to overhear the creaking of the ropes and the groaning of the windlass, to recognise the mustard-bowl in the rumbling of the thunder, and smell the resin in the flashes of the lightning. But whether such a style of historic painting does or does not fail of the secondary end of pleasing the reader, I am pretty sure that it can never give him the sound instruction which he ought to seek, and is entitled to demand, in a work professing to be a just history, and not a mere series of historic sketches. Distinguished men are not really just such as they appear in their best and greatest or their worst and meanest actions, nor is the course of things a set of abrupt volcanic explosions or wonderful conjunctures; and therefore any representation which sets men and things before us only in their picturesque and striking shapes and attitudes, which paints them only in their gaudiest or their darkest colours, without any of those dull neutral tints which tame down and harmonise such hues in real life, will tend to form an incorrect conception of the actors and of the scene. A work constructed upon such a plan bears much more the character of an *ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα* than of a *κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί.* And in the case immediately before us, while there is much in Dr. Merle D'Aubigné's bold sketch of Wickliffe and Lord Cobham to arouse enthusiasm in their favour, and bring out into bold relief the most prominent points in which they stood forth as champions of Protestantism, it cannot, I think, be fairly denied that a reader who took this account as a full and quite fair account of the men, their opinions and their

actions, would form by a great deal too elevated a conception of them. Do not imagine that I desire to depreciate Wickliffe. My feelings with respect to him are best expressed in the quaint but just language of one whose sagacity and fairness as an historian have seldom been sufficiently observed, because his readers have been for the most part too much dazzled by his wit to remark those more sterling qualities. 'Being,' says Fuller, 'to write the history of Wickliffe, I intend neither to deny, dissemble, defend nor excuse any of his faults. "We have this treasure," saith the Apostle, "in earthen vessels," and he that shall endeavour to prove a pitcher of clay to be a pot of gold will take great pains to small purpose. Yea, should I be over-officious to plead for Wickliffe's faults, that glorious saint would sooner chide than thank me, unwilling that, in favour of him, truth should suffer prejudice. He was a man, and so subject to error; living in a dark age, more obnoxious to stumble; vexed with opposition, which makes men reel into violence; and therefore it is unreasonable that the constitution and temper of his positive opinions should be guessed by his polemical heat when he was chafed in controversy.' With this apology, let me drop Dr. Merle D'Aubigné for the present, and apply myself exclusively to Wickliffe.

There is a certain class of philosophers who account for everything by external causes, and make no allowance for the peculiarities of individual minds. 'Hurd,' said Dr. Johnson, one evening, 'is a writer who affects to trace everything to the nature of things. If men, at a particular time, wore red plush breeches, he would not be satisfied without assigning reasons why at that particular time no other colour but red, and no other material but plush, could possibly have been chosen.' I would not, when I speak so often of predisposing causes, be understood to go quite so far as Hurd. But though in forming the character of men and of generations, external circumstances cannot do everything, they surely can do much. Though we can go no further than whim and accident for the red plush, Johnson himself, when not obstinately captious,

would have allowed that good reasons might be assigned for the general use of something more or less resembling breeches. And though it would puzzle even an Hegelian to demonstrate that the nature of things required that just such a person as John Wickliffe should have appeared in 1370, yet it is not too much to say that such a mind as John Wickliffe's being presupposed, we can see much in his circumstances to account for the direction in which he applied his energies. Wickliffe is to be regarded as a pupil of Bradwardine, and as a secular priest, and both these circumstances most likely contributed to influence him as a Reformer of the Church.

Bradwardine had been, in the generation previous, the grand reviver of the theology of Augustine; and I think that an attentive reader of history will perceive that there is somewhere or other some principle of antagonism to the full development of the Romish system in that theology. Wickliffe, Huss, and Luther all came straight from the school of Augustine. It was in the school of Augustine that the great Doctors of Jansenism were formed. And though the Dominican body is a proof that hearty Romanism may be reconciled with an attachment to the Augustinian system, yet they are at the same time a proof of the difficulty of such an alliance; since the devices by which the Dominicans reconcile their master's doctrines to the Decrees of the Council of Trent are such glaring instances of the 'non-natural style of interpretation' as almost to throw into the shade the subtleties of the celebrated Tract 90. It is a remarkable fact too, that till lately the Dominicans were the great obstacle to the formal recognition by the Church of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, thus showing a manifest want of sympathy with the rest of the Roman Catholic community in the latest and most decidedly pagan development of the Romish religion.

Nor is it, I think, very difficult to discern the source of this antagonism between the spirit of the Augustinian theology and that of the Romish system. It is not any logical re-

pugnance of which I speak, but one of another nature, often much more influential in matters of practice—a repugnance resulting from this, that the theology of Augustine is calculated to form a different kind of ἦθος or character from that which is quite congenial to Romanism. Where the proper Romanistic temper is fully developed, the prominent object of absorbing interest before the mind is the visible Church and its outward hierarchy and Sacramental rites, in which religion is as it were materialised, and even divine grace itself is conceived, not as a pure spiritual influence, but as a sort of mysterious force residing in gross corporeal elements. But where the system of Augustine has not merely gained the assent of the intellect, but fully mastered and warmed the whole mind, the grand object presented by it to the inward contemplation is one which cannot be placed before the outward eye—the invisible Church, the body of God's elect, as existing in His eternal counsels. Its tendency—I am not speaking of what may be fastened upon or severed from it by severe logical inference—its tendency is to fix the thought rather upon God, as the immediate cause of everything in religion, than upon the Church and the Sacraments—the channels of His saving influences; and thus to eclipse as it were the glories of that sensuous structure of the visible Church by the greater and purer lustre of the spiritual Church. Indeed, I believe that the case might be stated even more strongly than thus. I think that the Augustinian system not only tends to check the full development of the Romanistic character of mind, by bringing in the Church of the elect as a superior object of attraction to the visible Church, but that it directly clashes with some of the best established dogmas of Romanism, and indeed of the earlier Church too, and makes a mind that seeks to retain both it and them, feel painfully a sense of incongruity between the two. I think it is manifest that Augustine himself struggled under this painful difficulty in the case of infant baptism, and that his successors have felt it still more keenly. It is plain, I think, that his own system would never have naturally led

him to the conclusion that thousands of reprobate children—abandoned in the divine counsels from all eternity to hopeless perdition—were daily regenerated by that efficacious Sacrament, and made in some mysterious way the subjects of an unintelligible grace, which produced and was meant to produce no permanent effect whatever. Everyone must see at a glance that nothing, but the stern necessity of yielding to the authority of the Church, prevented Augustine and his followers from doing that which Calvin did at once, limiting the efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism to the elect. Upon the whole, then, we shall not, I suppose, be mistaken if we allow considerable weight to the influence of the Augustinian theology, as received from Bradwardine, as one of the causes which predisposed Wickliffe's mind towards its resolute opposition to the Romanism of his age. And we shall be the more confirmed in this opinion by observing some of the peculiar errors with which he was charged by his opponents; as for example: 'That he defined the Church to consist only of the predestinated;' 'that he held that baptism doth not confer but only signifies grace which was given before;' 'that he denied that all sins are abolished in baptism;' 'that he held that the Pope, if he doth not imitate Christ and Peter in his life and manners, is not to be called the successor of Peter.' All these betoken strong efforts to carry fully out the natural tendencies of Augustinianism. In effect, we know that the doctrine of Huss was always represented as essentially the same, in all points relating to the visible Church, with that of Wickliffe; and the Acts of the Council of Constance leave little room to doubt what the doctrine of Huss upon these matters was. The Church of the true elect, according to Huss, was the sole and exclusive depositary of those powers which are commonly claimed for the visible body of professing Christians; the Church of the elect, the sole subject of all those promises which are made in Scripture to the spouse of Christ. To be a Christian, he argued, is to be vitally united with Christ. Those who are thus united are Christians, and those who are not are infidels, whatever be their outward profession.

But it is absurd to say that one who is not a Christian at all can be a Christian Bishop; and hence he inferred that, since the ungodliness of many Popes and Prelates was matter of notoriety, the existence of a regular hierarchy was not a thing essential to the Church, and that Christ could and did govern the body of His elect in this world, with them or without them. These were undoubtedly the views of Huss, and these were, I think, substantially also the views of Wickliffe; and you see at once how naturally such views might have been suggested to the minds of both by the theology of Augustine. It was in the contemplation of the indefectible Church of the elect that Wickliffe and Huss, Calvin and Arnauld, Protestant and Jansenist, equally found repose, when the authority of the great outward organisation of the visible body of professing Christians was brought to bear against them.

But apart from this deeper source of Wickliffe's dogmatic Protestantism, there was another more obvious spring of opposition to Papal influence to be found in his position as a secular priest, and a secular English priest. The prejudices at once of his order and of his nation combined to keep up his natural courage in the warfare which he waged so strenuously against Italian tyranny.

The mendicant orders were at that time the pest of Europe, and the history of the Church through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is little else but a record of the trouble and turmoil which they occasioned; and I quite agree with Stillingfleet in thinking that all our Nonconformists put together never occasioned greater dissensions or more flagrant scandal, than the Franciscan friars then gave rise to in the very bosom of that Church which boasts so highly of its unity, and looks down with such sovereign disdain upon our divisions. The policy of the Church of Rome in canonising the extravagances of such a crazy enthusiast as Francis of Assisi has been much admired by some Protestant writers; and doubtless, of the two, it is safer to praise the policy than the honesty of such a proceeding. But it cannot be denied that, even in point of policy, St. Francis was rather a dear

bargain, when his sanctity was purchased for the benefit of the Church by a strife of nearly two hundred years, spent in continual efforts to bring his restless family into some kind of order, and persuade them to live quietly with their neighbours. And perhaps, in the long run, it will be found to have been the better policy to disown what is not really approved. We may be occasionally weakened in numbers by secessions, that might have been prevented by connivance at fanatical folly; but at least our character is not sullied, nor our whole credit brought into suspicion, by deliberately sanctioning what no sober-minded man can really regard with any other feelings than those of disgust, indignation, or pity. But be this as it may, it is important to our present purpose to observe that Wickliffe came upon the scene in the very heat of a great struggle between the Universities and secular clergy on one side, and the Pope and the friars upon the other. How boldly men of great weight in the Church had spoken in this controversy already, we see by the example of St. Amour in France, and Richard of Armagh in this country. The former of these, by a somewhat curious piece of exegesis, applies to the mendicant friars the Apostle's prophecy of the dangers of the latter days. 'Men,' he says, according to St. Paul, 'should be lovers of their own selves, not enduring reproof, covetous both of riches and applause, high-minded, because they would not be in subjection to their Bishops, but be set before them; and therefore disobedient to their spiritual fathers. 'And such as these,' he proceeds, 'are said to creep into houses, which the ordinary gloss expounds of entering into the houses of those who are in another's charge: these enter not by the door, as the rectors of churches do, but steal into them like thieves and robbers; and leading captive silly women is setting them against the Bishops and persuading them to monastic life. Those are likewise,' he goes on to say, 'false teachers, who though never so learned and holy, teach without being sent, and none are duly sent but such as are chosen and authorised by the Church, such as Bishops and Presbyters are; the one succeeding the Apostles,

the other the seventy disciples. Nor can the Pope himself give power to others to meddle in the charge of a parish or in preaching, but where they are invited to it; because even Bishops cannot act out of their own dioceses,' &c. with a great deal more to the same effect, mixing up after the manner of his time much really sound sense with very forced and fanciful interpretations of the Scriptures.[1] Equally bold, a hundred years later, and just before Wickliffe, was the tone of that great prelate, our countryman Richard Fitz-Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh in King Edward III.'s reign, who in his defence of the parochial clergy, expressly denies it to be in the Pope's power to grant such privileges to the friars as destroy the rights of the curates or the jurisdiction of the Bishops.[2]

What, then, you will say, could Wickliffe add more to such bold remonstrances as these? In truth he added a great deal more; he went as far beyond Richard of Armagh as Luther went beyond Gerbert and the leaders at Constance and at Basle. He denounced the whole body of the monastic orders, not merely as intruders within the fold of the parochial clergy, but as, in the very nature of their profession, presumptuous violators of the unity, the essential oneness, of the Christian Church. The vowing of virginity, he taught, is a doctrine of devils. The religious families—nuns, monks, and friars—confound the unity of Christ's body, who instituted but one order of serving Him. This was, indeed, to subvert the fundamental principle of the whole monastic system. He aimed, not like the divines of Paris or the good Archbishop of Armagh, merely at pruning away the straggling branches of that poisonous tree, but he struck at the main trunk of the gigantic plant which had overshadowed Christendom, nay he sought to tear up every fibre of its roots from the soil in which they were so deeply embedded.

---

[1] See an account of William de St. Amour, and his writings, in Dupin, *Hist. of Eccl. Writers*, vol. ii. pp. 476–479. Dublin, 1723.—EDITORS.

[2] *Defensio Curatorum adversus Fratres Mendicantes*, an oration before the Pope and Cardinals at Avignon, 1357. Paris, 1496, 1625, and 1633.—EDITORS.

Few men, I think, ever saw more clearly than Wickliffe that it is to one, and that the highest kind of sanctity, that all Christians are alike called ; but I think it cannot be fairly denied at the same time, that not a little of the same error as tinged the view of his mortal enemies the friars, infused itself into his own. The friars supposed that wealth and worldly splendour was inconsistent with spiritual perfection, and therefore they taught all who aspired to perfection to renounce such dangerous possessions, and emulate the state of poverty in which the primitive disciples lived. But then they tolerated imperfect Christians, nay they made allowance for several degrees of elevated sanctity itself. Now all such class distinctions among Christians were, as I have said, utterly repudiated by Wickliffe. But if I understand him aright, he was not disposed to refuse to concede to the Franciscans their other principle—a principle which long before Wickliffe had seized with great tenacity upon the popular mind of Europe.

In such of Wickliffe's writings as have come down to us, it is indeed chiefly in the form of denouncing Church endowments, and the wealth, rank, and luxury of the clergy, that this prejudice betrays itself; but when we couple these attacks upon his own order with his undoubted fundamental doctrine of the essential oneness of the Christian profession; when we find him distinctly charged with holding that the Church consists properly of the three members—clergy, soldiers, and labourers—there seem to me to be strong grounds for apprehending that Wickliffe only denied one of the Franciscan premises and heartily approved the other. This made his assault upon the Church endowments the more galling, as it was in effect a kind of argument *ad hominem*. And you will observe that, in taking this line, he secured to himself great advantages. He could fight the Bishops with the weapons of the friars, and the friars with the weapons of the Bishops.

Certainly, with respect to Church property nothing can well be plainer than his view. His language upon that subject is unmeasured. The famous, but fabulous gift of Con-

stantine was, according to him, the *fons ac origo malorum* in Christendom—

> Ex illo fluere et retro sublapsa referri
> Spes Danaûm.

And the only way of restoring the Church to its pristine purity was to expel the rankling poison from its veins. Tithes he regarded as mere alms to be voluntarily contributed by the parishioners, and which the parishioners ought accordingly to withhold from a priest of unscriptural sentiments or dissolute life, and which even to the best pastor they should not be compelled to pay. He was himself Rector of Lutterworth; but we are bound to suppose that his practice in dealing with his parishioners was in accordance with his principles; indeed, if it had not been so, we should doubtless have heard of the inconsistency. His adversaries were not the men to let so tempting an opportunity slip of blackening the moral character of one in whose panoply of rectitude it was not easy to find a flaw. And if, as tradition asserts, Wickliffe is to be identified with the Good Parson of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales,' we have direct contemporary evidence to the fact that in this respect he acted as he taught. It is worth while to cite the passage, and I will give it you not in the rugged lines of the now antiquated original, but in the flowing measure in which Dryden has so graciously invested it.

> The tithes his parish freely paid, he took,
> But never sued, or cursed with bell and book,
> With patience bearing wrong, but offering none,
> Since every man is free to lose his own.
> The country churls, according to their kind,
> (Who grudge their dues and love to be behind),
> The less he sought his off'rings, pinched the more,
> And praised a priest contented to be poor.
> The Prelate for his holy life he prized,
> The worldly pomp of prelacy despised.
> His Saviour came not with a gaudy show,
> Nor was His kingdom of the world below.
> Patience in want and poverty of mind,
> These marks of Church and Churchmen He designed,
> And living taught and dying left behind.

The crown He wore was of the pointed thorn,
In purple He was crucified, not born.
They who contend for place and high degree
Are not His sons, but those of Zebedee.

Such doctrines, when the personal application of them is made to churchmen, have always been sufficiently acceptable to many of the Barons of England; and it was, we know, to the hearty patronage of such men as John of Gaunt and Lord Percy, that Wickliffe more than once was indebted for his personal safety. Whether or not these men ever reflected upon the universal applicability of Wickliffe's principle—whether they ever pondered upon the significant language of his 'Trialogus,' where he says that 'all the faithful are bound to follow the example of Christ,' I know not; but I am sure that they might have profitably attended to such a warning as Hooker gave their successors:—'The chiefest thing which lay reformers yawn for, is that the clergy may through conformity in state and condition be Apostolical, poor as the Apostles of Christ were poor. . . . But the Church of Christ is a body mystical. A body cannot stand unless the parts thereof be proportionable. Let it therefore be required on both parts, at the hands of the clergy, to be in meanness of state like the Apostles; at the hand of the laity to be as they were who lived under the Apostles: and in this reformation there will be, though little wisdom, yet some indifferency.'[3]

Probably they cared as little for logical consequences of doctrine as the plunderers of the Church have generally cared for such things. One thing they saw clearly, that according to Wickliffe the possessions of the clergy could not be called the property of the Church at all; that all such endowments were absolutely null *ab initio*; and they were satisfied probably by a generous self-sacrifice to take this burden from the shoulders of the priesthood and place it on their own. Like Wickliffe's parishioners of Lutterworth, they 'praised a priest contented to be poor,' without being at all contented to be equally poor themselves; and probably befriended the ascetic

[3] Preface to *Eccl. Pol.* IV. 3, vol. i. p. 159.—Ed. Keble.

Reformer much in the same spirit as that in which the dissolute Morton patronised John Knox, and the profligate Leicester supported Cartwright against Whitgift. One incident, almost the only one of which any detailed account remains in the life of Wickliffe, strongly illustrates the advantages which he derived from these powerful patrons. Wickliffe had been cited to appear before Sudbury, the Archbishop of Canterbury, at St. Paul's. Wickliffe appeared, but with such a retinue as placed him on an equality with his judges. The Duke of Lancaster, the Regent of the Kingdom, walked at his side, and Percy, the Earl Marshal of England, cleared the way before him. With such an usher, it is easy to believe that there was but little ceremony in the introduction; and Courtenay, Bishop of London—himself a man of some of the noblest and oldest blood in Europe—soon lost patience at the profane uproar made by the Marshal and his men among the priests and citizens who thronged the body of the church.

'Lord Percy,' he said, 'if I had known beforehand what masteries you would have kept in the church, I would have stopped you out from coming hither.'

'He shall keep such masteries here,' replied Lancaster bluntly, 'though you say nay.'

Wickliffe meanwhile was modestly standing, leaning on his staff, in his plain russet frock, in the midst of the splendid assembly. The Earl Marshal observed this, and to mark more strongly his respect for the Rector of Lutterworth and his contempt for the Bishops, bade him sit down. 'You have,' he said, 'many things to answer, and you need to repose yourself on a soft seat.'

Here the Norman blood of Bishop Courtenay took fire again. Indeed it is difficult to believe that Percy did not intend to provoke him by such a proceeding. 'It is unreasonable,' he cried, 'that one cited before his Ordinary should sit down during his answer. He must and shall stand.' But the haughty Bishop had met more than his match. 'The Lord Percy's motion for Wickliffe,' said John of Gaunt, 'is but reasonable. And as for you, my Lord Bishop, who are

so proud and arrogant, I will bring down the pride not of you alone, but of all the prelacy in England.'

'Do your worst, sir,' retorted Courtenay. 'Thou bearest thyself,' continued Lancaster, not heeding the interruption, 'thou bearest thyself so brag upon thy parents (he was the son of Hugh Earl of Devonshire), which shall not be able to help thee; they shall have enough to do to help themselves.' 'My confidence,' replied Courtenay, remembering in good time the proper dignity of a churchman, 'is not in my parents, nor in any man else, but only in God, in whom I trust, by whose assistance I will be bold to speak the truth.' At this answer Lancaster seems to have quite lost his self-command; he turned to those about him, and said in a kind of stage-whisper audible to the assembly, 'Rather than take such words from him, I will pluck the Bishop by the hair out of the church.' At this speech the ire of the Londoners could no longer be restrained. The Consistory was broken up in confusion. Lancaster and Percy had to fly for their lives, and it was some days before, and that mainly through Courtenay's personal exertions, the tumult could be allayed.[4]

The temporal Lords, I think, took a very short-sighted view of their own interest when they thus taught the people to despise their spiritual Peers. And, however the greedy Barons might have at first flattered themselves that such doctrines as those of Wickliffe about restoring Apostolic poverty might be confined to the estate of the clergy, their tenants were soon found not at all disposed to make such a merely one-sided application of them. The Socialist insurrection of Wat Tyler soon opened men's eyes upon that subject; and the famous distich:

When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?

was a question from which they naturally shrank. Wickliffe indeed had nothing at all to do directly with that disgraceful movement; but the fact, that it was for some time popularly re-

---

[4] Collier, *Eccl. Hist. of Great Britain*. vol. i. p. 565.

garded as a Lollard movement, is a significant fact. And we can easily see in what way Wickliffe's teaching may have indirectly helped to support it. 'I demand,' said Wickliffe, in a petition to the House of Commons, 'I demand that the poor people of our towns and villages be not constrained to furnish a worldly priest, often a wicked man and a heretic, with the means of satisfying his pride, his gluttony, his licentiousness; of buying a showy horse, costly saddles, bridles with tinkling bells, rich garments, and soft furs, while they see their wives, children, and neighbours dying of hunger.' This is at all times dangerous language to use in the ears of a hungry people. The logic of famine is very quick and decisive in its inferences; and a starving people soon perceived that a profligate baron stood in no better position than a profligate priest, and that if they might withhold the tithes of their rector, they might equally withhold the rent of their landlord. This is an easy lesson in political justice, which has at all times been readily learned, and it is difficult fairly to deny its truth.

But certainly, in one point at least, Wat Tyler and his ruffian crew were as much opposed to Wickliffe as they were to the Barons and the Priests. Reading and writing were in their estimation deadly sins—iniquity to be punished by the judge. On this point there was no sympathy between them and the genuine Lollards. Indeed, the most useful part of all Wickliffe's labours were his literary labours, and specially his labours upon the translation of the Bible. It is, indeed, an error to suppose that the former dark ages have been so entirely dark as not to permit the appearance of any vernacular version of the Scriptures, at least of some parts of them, before the time of Wickliffe. Bede had translated the Gospel of John; some portions both of the Old and New Testament had been translated into Saxon in the reigns of Alfred and Ethelred; there was an old Anglo-Norman paraphrase on the Gospels and the Acts, and the celebrated hermit Hampole had, still later, given a version of the Psalms, the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles.

But to Wickliffe the English people were indebted for a version of the whole Bible, made of course from the Vulgate, for the Reformer was wholly unacquainted with either Greek or Hebrew, into the current language of their own day, and for the zealous activity with which he sought to render it accessible not only to the learned and to the rich, but to all classes of the community.

The effect of this measure in propagating the doctrines of the Reformation was very great. In truth, the whole population of England was very largely leavened with them. And Knyghton, a Roman Catholic author of the times, informs us that if two persons were met travelling on the highway, the chances were that one of them was a Lollard. Cowling, the seat of the celebrated Lord Cobham, became in process of time the grand centre of the Wickliffite community. He was a man remarkable in his day for many things, and not least for the heroic constancy with which he suffered martyrdom. But I should have respected him the more if he had not used the secular arm himself to repress the adversaries of the Lollard preachers, and if he had not, in the close of his great struggles, taken up arms in his defence. I will not enter into the question whether such resistance may not be sometimes justifiable in the abstract; a man certainly does not lose his rights as a citizen by becoming a Christian. But all this might be equally said in the case of the first believers as in the case of the first reformers; and when the Apostles pressed their converts not only constantly to speak the truth, but also patiently to suffer for the truth's sake, lest the name of God and His doctrine should be blasphemed, I believe they gave the wisest possible advice that can be given under such circumstances. Any temporary advantages that can be gained by violent measures are, I believe, of small weight in comparison with the load of scandal which is thus brought upon the true religion; while opposition of this kind once provoked furnishes a plausible excuse for continuing the persecution, and may be even artfully made to justify its beginning. 'For see,' it will be said, 'the temper of these men; if

they did not exhibit this violence at first, it was because they were not yet prepared for it. We acted wisely, therefore, in anticipating their measures, and seeking to crush their insurrection before it was ripe to break out.' It is to be remembered, too, that when the friends of religion unfurl the banner and take the field, their ranks will soon be joined by men whose sympathy is rather with the war than with the creed, and for all the excesses that such adherents may commit, the cause of Christ will be held answerable by the world.

LECTURE III.

PREDISPOSING CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

Gentlemen,—In my last lecture, as you may remember, I enumerated among the circumstances which may have predisposed Wickliffe to resistance of the Papal power, that of his being an English priest. I know that it has been said and repeated in many popular books that, for some centuries before the Reformation, England was at once the richest and most patient province in the Pope's dominions; but, as far as I can see, this has been asserted not only without, but against evidence. If you will but cast your eyes over that great record of mediæval times, accessible to every hand and open to every eye, the body of the canon law, you will at once be struck by the proof which it carries on the face of it, that a long succession of Pontiffs bestowed an amount of vigilant and anxious care upon their English subjects which argues anything rather than serene contentment with a tranquil state of things. The Popes were not usually persons apt to take a great deal of trouble for nothing, and they had for the most part quite enough to occupy even the most restless spirits on the great continent of Europe; so that it is probable that if they had felt their interest pretty secure in a distant outlying region like England, they would have been generally satisfied to let well alone, and that in such circumstances the Chancellery at Rome would not have been found continually labouring with voluminous rescripts to English prelates upon English affairs. But if we turn from the laws of the Pope to the laws of the realm of England, as established by

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

its Parliaments and expounded by its Judges; if we look at the contemporary statutes and the contemporary Year Books, we shall see quite enough to account for the anxious solicitude with which Rome appears to have watched over a people, at all times ill-disposed to 'lie at the foot of a proud conqueror.' From the famous Mortmain Act in Edward I.'s time down to the equally famous Act of Præmunire in Henry V.'s,[1] our statute-book shows a long series of laws well fitted to arouse the indignant opposition of the Roman Court. If these statutes had been, like the laws of some other nations, mere royal decrees, they would not have carried with them half the weight which they actually bore. A mere contest between the Crown and the Tiara was a sort of conflict from which the Pope never recoiled. On the contrary, it was the character of guardian of the people's rights against the prince, a character which circumstances often enabled him to assume—it was to this character that the sovereign Pontiff owed a very large share of the influence he exercised over the affairs of Europe in the middle ages. But the laws of which I speak were Acts of Parliament, of Parliaments in which not only the estate of the clergy itself was represented, but in which from day to day the Commons were gaining more and more influence; and it is remarkable that the antipapal character of these acts becomes stronger and stronger in proportion as the House of Commons rises into importance. The reign of Edward III.—the era of Wickliffe—is generally regarded as the time when the Commons assumed something of the same

---

[1] The lecturer is plainly speaking of what took place before the time of Henry VIII. The Acts of *Præmunire* of Henry VIII., from being the completion of the previous legislation, are now commonly spoken of as the Acts of *Præmunire*, while the earlier Acts are spoken of as the statutes against Provisors. But they were, at least from the time of Richard II., strictly speaking, Acts of *Præmunire*, so named from the writ prescribed to be issued against offenders, which contained the words *Præmunire facias A.B.*, 'Cause A. B. to be forewarned that he appear before us to answer the contempt wherewith he stands charged.' See Blackstone, iv. 8, who, speaking of Edward I., says: 'In the thirty-fifth year of his reign was made the first statute against papal provisions, being, according to Sir Edward Coke, the foundation of all the subsequent statutes of *præmunire*.'—EDITORS.

position as they now occupy in the constitution of Parliament—and it was in the reign of Edward III. that the Act of Provisors was passed. From that time a succession of 'heavy blows and great discouragements' to the Papal power follow rapidly till the confirmation against Provisors under Henry V., an Act which Martin V. not unreasonably stigmatised as *execrabile statutum*, and which really left little more to be done by Henry VIII. than vigorously to carry out its provisions. It was manifest from the first that the Act of Præmunire and the canon law could not stand together, and though breaches of its stern provisions were connived at by successive princes, they were still breaches of the law; the ultimate issue of which was to place the whole estate of the clergy of England, their persons and their estates, at the king's mercy, and enable him to exact from them whatever conditions of redemption he might choose. And it is remarkable that whenever these antipapal statutes were relaxed, it was royal policy and not popular desire which led to the relaxation of them. Let us take, for example, the Act of Provisors, which restrained the Pope from forestalling appointments to benefices already full. In the fifteenth year of Richard II., that weak prince was anxious to place himself on good terms with the Pope, and a Parliament was summoned to enable him to do so. And after a persuasive oration from the Archbishop of York, the Lord Chancellor, the Commons—for you will observe the Commons were the chief reluctant party—were induced to concede that the king, by the advice and consent of the Lords, might dispense with the said statute, so as should be reasonable and useful, till the next Parliament, but so as the said statute should be repealed in no article of it. And they reserve to themselves the liberty of disagreeing at the next Parliament. And they conclude with a solemn protestation that this was a novelty not practised before, and which ought not to be drawn into example and precedent for the future; and they desire this protestation might be entered and recorded in the rolls of Parliament, which the king accordingly commanded to be done.

Similar proceedings recur at intervals through the reigns of Richard II. and Henry IV., the Commons in every instance appearing as the party to be won over by the Court to consent to tolerate these intrusive proceedings of the Pope; till at last, in the first of Henry V., they seem to have lost all patience, and we meet with a firm remonstrance addressed by them to the Crown, in which they demand that the statutes may be henceforth in full force against Provisors, and that no protection or grant made by the king to hinder the execution of the said statutes shall be allowable or of any force, and whatever is done contrary to them shall be null; to which the king answers, 'let the statutes be observed and kept.'

The truth is that these successive Acts of Parliament were but expressions and developments of the spirit of the old common law of England which we inherit from our Saxon forefathers, and which has in so remarkable a manner fixed the peculiar character of all our institutions. Now the genius of the common law of England is undoubtedly insular. It treats us as 'penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos.' Inherited from the good old Saxon times, when the Bishop and the Alderman sat side by side on the same bench as the co-ordinate magistrates of an essentially English realm, it obstinately refuses to recognise the existence of any institutions but its own, still less of any power which can justly claim a right to interfere with or modify those institutions. And this character of the common law of England is an impression which it takes from the temper of the people of England. They are formed by nature and by habit not to submit but to rule, and that union of courage and perseverance which they so eminently possess has always enabled them, sooner or later, to make others bend before their obstinate resolution.

Stern in each bosom, reason holds her seat,
With daring aims irregularly great;
Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,
I see the lords of human race pass by.

In England Rome met a spirit as proud and unbending as her own, not merely now and then in the person of the

prince, as in her struggles with the German Emperors, but in a much more formidable and permanent body, the collective Commons of the realm.

Nor were the homebred English clergy exempt from the influence of this genius of the national character. Such men as Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln, were indeed rare; yet there is evidence that the traditions of the Saxon Church, as it stood incorporated with the constitution, in those days of Edward the Confessor to which the hearts of the rural population of England so long turned with fond regret, lingered among the body of the parochial clergy and the capitular corporations. We know what a desperate struggle was made by the English clergy in Henry I.'s time against the enforcement of the continental canons against the marriage of priests; and the Decretals alone, to go no further, afford conclusive evidence that long after the formal recognition of celibacy as the law of the Church in England, a kind of left-handed marriage was not at all uncommon among the rural priesthood. Indeed, in our old poems and story books, the priest's leman or concubine is a personage who constantly figures, as freely mentioned, and with as little apparent sense of scandal or impropriety, as if they had been speaking only of his niece or housekeeper. We have a remarkable rescript in the reign of King John from Innocent III. to the then Bishop of Exeter, which is evidence at once of the practice of the clergy of that diocese, and of the way in which it was commonly regarded by the people. The Bishop consults his Holiness upon a difficulty which he found in enforcing the canons of the Church. That some of his clergy kept concubines, he complains, was matter of public notoriety. But when he was disposed to proceed against them, no witness could be induced to appear for their condemnation.[2]

It is manifest that an extensive practice of concubinage among the clergy must have tended at once to strengthen the ties which bound them to the commonwealth, and to loosen those which knit them to the Pope.

---

[2] Corp. Jur. Can. *Decret. Greg.*, l. iii. t. ii. c. 8.

But besides this not very reputable motive, which by the way was not peculiar to England, but existed even in a greater degree in Switzerland and parts of Germany, there were other influences at work upon the British clergy. The Papal power was felt everywhere by the inferior clergy in a way little fitted to make them in love with it. The bishoprics and the deaneries, the best livings, they saw continually wrested from their grasp and bestowed on foreign ecclesiastics; hardly a benefice could pass to an Englishman without taxes and deductions innumerable, for the advantage of the Roman Court and its favourites; and even in the remotest and poorest parishes of the land, the friar, with his patent of exemption and privileges from the Holy Father, was ever and anon showing his unwelcome face to supplant the curate in the affections of the people, and divert a large share of the miserable dues and offerings from the pocket of the legitimate pastor. The English clergy could not but feel such treatment; and the comparatively free constitution of their Church gave them a spirit of independence which made them the less disposed to submit to it. The English priesthood have always stood in a peculiar position, in virtue of that all-pervading influence of the common law to which I have already called your attention, and which has been ever working to mould every institution it finds within the confines of the realm to a conformity with its own genius. The English parson, from the times of the good King Edward, was, in the eye of the law, a corporation sole. The tithes of his parish did not derive to him through the Bishop, but accrued to himself directly. His benefice was his freehold; as such it came under the protection of the temporal judge, and could not be legally given to an alien. It is not strange therefore, that with the rights of a citizen, the English parson caught something of the spirit of a citizen. And this feeling was the more fostered by the structure of our ecclesiastical assemblies, in which the inferior clergy, like the Commons, sat apart in a separate House from the Bishops, had an independent voice in the framing of canons, and a power of taxing themselves as the citizens of a free state.

You will doubtless have observed, however, that the direct tendency of the causes which I have been enumerating in the present lecture was only to produce a revolt from the yoke of Papal supremacy in England—not at all to produce a general reformation of doctrine. That, however, would even by itself have been a great step, though an indirect one, towards such a reformation. For the Papal supremacy was itself a doctrine, and what is more, had become in the Western Church such a keystone of doctrine, that the removal of it endangered at once the dissolution of the whole arch. That a system of doctrine essentially similar to the Romish may subsist without a Pope is evident, not merely in theory, but from the practical proof of the existence of the Greek Church. But then you should reflect that in the East no Bishop ever filled the place of a sovereign Pontiff. No single Bishop or Patriarch was ever looked up to as the necessary centre of the whole Church's unity. Now this constitutes an essential difference between the cases in the East and in the West. The established dogmas of the prevailing creed, both in the East and in the West, were alike received upon the authority of the Church. But in the West, the voice which practically spoke as the voice of the Church was that of the successor of St. Peter; the note of the true Church which was continually before men's eyes was its connection with the chair of Peter. The Church was as it were embodied to the popular eye in the person of the Bishop of Rome, and you could not shake men's faith in him without at the same time shaking their faith in the whole system which ultimately bottomed itself in their minds upon his authority. It was, I am convinced, a sense of this, wrought in them by experience, which produced the reaction towards Popery in Queen Mary's time. A large portion of those who had heartily co-operated in Henry VIII.'s bold proceedings were men upon whom such motives as I have been detailing were the only ones that exercised any strong influence. That Gardiner and Bonner, for instance, had no quarrel with the doctrines of Romanism in general is most manifest—they were on the contrary strenuous and consistent

maintainers of them throughout; but then I think it is unreasonable to deny, on the other hand, their sincerity either in first opposing the Pope's authority or in afterwards so earnestly asserting it. That they were not mere unblushing time-servers was proved by their conduct in Edward VI.'s reign; and I can well conceive that a change in their sentiments may have been wrought in the way that I have endeavoured to indicate. Their beau-ideal of a Church was probably a kind of insular Byzantinism, in which the King of England should take in his own realm the place which the Emperor at Constantinople filled in the East, and which the Hohenstaufen had sought to occupy in Germany. But they found this, like some later ideals of Anglicanism, incapable of being realised. They perceived that they were in a false position; they felt that they must either advance or retreat; and they soon made up their minds to the latter alternative, and certainly, when they had the power, manifested a very flaming zeal to repair the mischief which they had done to the Papal interest; though even in Mary's reign they showed plainly enough that they had not quite forgotten the old principles of English law, and that they were not disposed to yield a point more than was absolutely needful to the Pope's authority.

But what might or might not have been the ultimate issue of the operation of such causes as we have been considering, if they had been left to work out their effect entirely alone, is after all a mere matter of speculation. In point of fact they did not operate alone. And the peculiar character of the English Reformation was derived not from any one set of influences, but from several independent ones, which by a rare conjuncture of circumstances acted together just then, and produced as their resultant a movement which was not precisely in the simple direction of any one; and the various after-disturbances of that Reformation have mainly arisen from a separation of these forces and a breaking of their just proportions. It will be important therefore to bring them all, or at least the chief of them, before you under one view.

First, then, there was in England, as there has been in almost every Christian state, a struggle for predominance between the temporal and the spiritual power, which (for the reasons I have already assigned) took naturally the shape (1) of a struggle between the King and the Pope for absolute supremacy; and (2) of the genius of the English constitution against the absolute supremacy of either King or Pope.

Again, there was in England, as in every other country in Europe, very remarkably in France, and still more so perhaps in Bohemia, an ecclesiastical struggle for the liberties of the National Church against the usurpations of the Pope.

Thirdly, there was the Lollard movement.

Fourthly, there was the direct influence of the revival of letters, and what may be called in general the philosophical spirit of free inquiry, common to England with the rest of Europe.

Fifthly, there was the sympathetic influence of the German Reformation, a movement capable of harmonising in all its essential elements with our own.

And sixthly, at a later period, the influence of the Swiss and French Reformations.

All these various forces must, I think, be taken into account by anyone who would duly estimate the great religious revolution of which we are treating.

Let us endeavour, however briefly, to analyse them somewhat in detail.

I have said that along with the struggle for supremacy between the King and the Pope, there was another going on between the genius of the English constitution and absolutism whether papal or regal. But during the reign of the Tudor princes this latter was so much covered by, or apparently lost in the former, that a superficial observer, if he confined his attention wholly to that time, would not readily distinguish it. It becomes very easily distinguishable, however, when we enlarge our field of vision, and take in the time preceding Henry VII. and following Queen Elizabeth. In the earlier times we shall often see the Commons alone engaged in

active opposition to Papal usurpations, while the Crown is disposed to tolerate or connive at them for a time. In the later times, we shall see the Commons waging the same war against the Royal, as they had before carried on against the Papal prerogatives. The first set of phenomena make it plain that the Commons had a quarrel of their own with the Pope, distinct from the king's quarrel. The second, that it was not merely with Papal absolutism they were discontented, but with the domination itself, by whomsoever exercised. How then are we to account for the appearances which present themselves under the Tudor dynasty? I think that the true account of them is, that theirs was a time when the popular and royal forces united to crush two common enemies, the power of the Barons and the power of the Pope.

The power of the Barons fell first, under Henry VII.; the power of the Pope received a stunning blow from Henry VIII., revived again under Mary, but was finally overthrown by Queen Elizabeth. And then, when these two great antagonists were removed, the temporary nature of the bond which had united so closely the monarchical and the democratic elements of the constitution became manifest to all.

Against either the Barons or the Pope the Commons felt that they could not stand alone; and the king, on his side, felt equally that he needed all the support which he could derive from a united people. Accordingly, in the highest and most amazing stretches of power on the part of Henry VIII. and his daughter, they always carried with them the sanction of Parliament; and the Parliament acquiesced in such strange proceedings from a conviction that the power which they granted would be used in the direction which they would themselves desire. This, I take it, is to a great extent the true account of the apparent servility of the House of Commons in the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth. Those princes occupied a critical position which no British sovereign ever filled before or since. Anything which would have produced a change in their policy, anything which would have materially weakened their hands or considerably eclipsed the splen-

dour of their royal dignity in the eyes of the populace, would probably have been fatal to the success of that great movement which was gradually securing for ever the State and Church of England from the Italian tyranny under which it had so long groaned. The king's name was then indeed a tower of strength. No doubt many a cool and sharp-sighted statesman among the Commons saw clearly, what all felt instinctively, that the venerable idea of the Holy Father at Rome could not be safely or permanently torn from the popular mind, unless its place were filled by something else that might be invested with similar attributes; and that the great Whig image of the Constitution in Church and State was a form too cold and abstract to suit the temper of the times. Partly then, as I said, from deliberate policy, and partly from a sort of instinct which at some conjunctures acts as surely as politic sagacity, they seized upon what Englishmen had been taught to regard as the next most sacred person to the Pope as the object of those feelings of reverence which they sought to detach from the Bishop of Rome; and they felt that they could not without risk of immediate peril to the whole cause, expose at once to a severe trial the sentiment of loyalty to the temporal and loyalty to the spiritual power, which men had been accustomed hitherto to hold in such profound reverence.

This, I think, accounts for the extraordinary plenitude of dignity and prerogative in which the Tudor princes appear invested, and which Hume, in his faithless, and I fear deliberately faithless, 'History of England,' would fain persuade us was always the true and undoubted plenitude of dignity and prerogative belonging of right to an English monarch. The truth is that, as I have said, the position filled by the Tudor princes, and which Hume absurdly takes as the normal position of a British sovereign, was a position essentially abnormal, and which no other princes of this country ever did or could fill, because no other princes ever found a similar conjuncture of circumstances. Even during the Tudor dynasty itself, no prince fully occupied this position but Henry VIII., in whom for the first time the rival colours of

the white and red rose were completely blended, and who swayed the sceptre just at the crisis when England was first severed from the Roman See, and when men's thoughts were all concentrated upon the one object of breaking the Papal yoke. He and he alone bore the title of Head of the Church, and he and he alone wielded openly the two swords which Hobbes afterwards placed in the hands of his 'Leviathan.'[3] It is true that in Henry VII.'s time the lawyers had begun to talk of the king as a *mixta persona, unita cum sacerdotibus*, and they give this as a reason why priests might be tried at common law; but this is only a straggling dictum of some nameless authority, and rests upon the traditionary report of one of Henry VIII.'s judges. Certainly the theory which it applies was not carried out so early. As for Elizabeth, she publicly and in terms renounced the title which her father had assumed; and it is manifest to a penetrating eye, that towards the end of her reign the obsequiousness of her Parliament and the nation in general to her will, sprang more from feelings personal in regard to herself, than from that deep veneration for the mysterious character and undefined prerogative of the Lord's anointed, to which it might on a more superficial survey seem entirely due.

I do not, of course, mean to deny that the feeling of which I speak—a feeling which invested the sovereign with a sort of indelible character of sanctity which no conduct on his part could efface—existed, and existed strongly at that time and afterwards; but only that the charm which had made it universal and irresistible in her infamous father's time was broken; and that many minds in the nation were already accustoming themselves to scan the royal luminary with an undazzled gaze, and to make remarks upon its specks and imperfections. But to enter upon this reaction now would be to anticipate matters which will naturally find a more appropriate place hereafter. Let us at present dwell a little longer upon the circumstances which lent for a time such extraor-

---

[3] This plainly only refers to the past. Edward VI., and even Mary, held it after Henry.—EDITORS.

dinary splendour to the royal office. And another of these circumstances was, that not only the statesmen for the most part, but the great body of the secular clergy, suddenly flung all their weight into the royal scale. From thenceforth the pulpits rang with discourses upon the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome, the divine and indefeasible right of kings, and the duty of an absolute and unqualified submission to them. Almost the whole machinery which the Pope might have expected to have been able to employ for his own purposes was thus turned against him, and with terrible effect. The days of interdicts were past, and it was now not by submission to the Pope, but by opposition to him, that a man was likely to gain a share in the prayers and sacraments of the Church. What extravagant lengths some of the clergy were prepared at first to go, is revealed by the famous manuscript which Burnet published from Stillingfleet's Collection. In that manuscript is the question, apparently proposed by Henry, Whether the Apostles, lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made Bishops by that necessity or by authority given by God? Cranmer deliberately answers, 'that all Christian princes have committed unto them, immediately of God, the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance; and in both these ministrations they must have sundry ministers under them to supply that which is wanted to their several offices. The civil ministers under the king's majesty in this realm of England be those whom it shall please his highness for a time to put in authority under him, as for example the lord chancellor, the lord treasurer, &c. The ministers of God's word under his majesty be the bishops, parsons, vicars, and such other priests as be appointed by his highness to that ministration.'[4]

To the question whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop or priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient? Cranmer answers in like

---

[4] Burnet, *Hist. Ref.*, Records, Book III. xxi. Quest. 9.

manner. 'In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election, or appointing thereto is sufficient.' If we lay these two answers together, it will be evident that according to the view which the Archbishop of Canterbury then held, the King of England could appoint his bishops and clergy in as easy and summary a manner as he could the justice in eyre or the colonel of a regiment. It was fortunate, I think, that Henry's own good sense kept him back from putting forward such unheard of claims. And it should be added that the replies of the other bishops and divines, though very strong in favour of the regal supremacy, do none of them go the same length as Cranmer's, and that some of them expressly contradict his. It would appear also that these are not Cranmer's settled or permanent opinions, and that he afterwards held a different view upon the subject.

But there must have been a great revolution in the feelings of English churchmen when an Archbishop of Canterbury could boldly, and without any circumlocution or ambiguity, express such sentiments as these.

I believe, however, that if the people had once been taught to view the clergy in this light, as the mere subordinate officers of the Crown, the effect of such teaching would have been very different from what the propounders of it expected. The Church, I think, from that day forth would have been unable to lend any support to the civil power, unless the king had actually assumed the insignia of the clerical office in as full a manner as the Pope, in which case again, the inevitable result would have been that, as with the Pope, the kingly office would have been practically merged in the sacerdotal. But the more likely issue in such a realm as England would have been unquestionably that the clergy would have lost the respect which had hitherto been rendered to their functions. The Church would have been considered as a mere department of police. The solemn crowning and unctioning of the king by the high prelates of the kingdom would no longer have worn the aspect which it had worn

hitherto, of investiture with the sacred office by the immediate delegates of heaven, but of a mere court ceremonial, in which the creatures of the royal will performed an unmeaning piece of pageantry.

In reality, as time went on and experience gradually opened men's eyes, it was seen that Henry and his advisers, though they never went this length, had, in their zeal for the royal supremacy, gone to such lengths as to endanger the permanence of that very power which they sought to exalt; and the strenuous supporters of the royal prerogative soon began to lean rather to the hierarchical, or High Church view, than to that which we commonly call Erastianism. The Church, like the Commons, came at last to remember that her liberties might be endangered not only by a Papal but by a Royal tyrant.

But the Church was naturally much slower in taking any active measures of opposition than the State, since it so happened that she and the Crown were much longer engaged on the same side, and against the same enemies, than the Commons and the Crown. When the power of the Barons and of the Pope had been beaten down, the Commons began to feel their strength, and to see that they might now make a stand against prerogative without danger of reviving either feudalism or popery. But in this new conflict they were joined by allies whom the King and the Church regarded almost with equal aversion. I mean the Protestant Nonconformists; and as an engine for the suppression of such formidable adversaries, the Bishops were content to leave the Crown some very questionable elements of the ecclesiastical supremacy, while satisfied that those equivocal powers would be in practice directed by their will and wielded for their benefit.

It was not until an open Romanist sat upon the throne in the person of James II., that the clergy's eyes were fully opened to the danger of such a court of royal prerogative as the High Commission. The liberties of the Church were then found to be in real danger from the prince, and the royal power having thus become an engine for subverting at once

the civil and religious institutions of England, the necessity of some measures of resistance was forced upon both Prelates and Politicians, Churchmen and Dissenters.

It is curious to observe that after the Revolution, it was the Low Church party who appeared as the maintainers of the royal prerogative in ecclesiastical matters which they had so sternly repressed in civil affairs, while the High Churchmen, with Atterbury at their head, stood forth as its strenuous assailants. For a Calvinistic Presbyterian was now upon the throne. The Convocation of the Clergy had been turned into a means of annoying and embarrassing the Whig party, and the king's prerogative ecclesiastical supplied the minister of the day with a ready and compendious method for silencing those troublesome assemblies.

But in this deduction of matters to their distant consequences we have been drawn too far from our immediate subject.

LECTURE IV.

INFLUENCE OF THE REVIVAL OF LETTERS—ERASMUS.

Gentlemen,—In speaking of the influence of the revival of letters upon the English Reformation, it is impossible that one's thoughts should not immediately revert to him whose name is identified with that revival, Erasmus. 'It was not,' says Bishop Stillingfleet, 'it was not Luther or Zwinglius that contributed so much to the Reformation as Erasmus, especially among us in England; for Erasmus was the man who awakened men's understandings and brought them from the friars' divinity to a relish for general learning. He by his wit laughed down the imperious ignorance of the monks, and made them the scorn of Christendom; and by his learning he brought most of the Latin Fathers to light, and published them with excellent editions and useful notes. By which means men of parts set themselves to consider the ancient Church from the writings of the Fathers themselves, and not from the Canonists and Schoolmen. So that most learned and impartial men were prepared for the doctrines of the Reformation before it brake forth. For it is a foolish thing to imagine that a quarrel between two monks at Wittenberg should make such an alteration in the state of Christendom; but things had been tending that way a good while before, by the gradual restoration of learning in these Western parts. The Greeks coming into Italy after the taking of Constantinople, and bringing their books with them, laid the first foundation of it. Then some of the princes of Italy advanced their own reputation by the encouragement they gave to it. From them

it spread into Germany, and there Reuchlin and his companions joined Hebrew with Greek. From thence it came into France and England. When men had by this means attained unto some skill in languages, they thought it necessary to search the Old and New Testaments in their original tongues, which they had heard of, but few had seen; not above one Greek Testament being to be found in all Germany. When Erasmus prints it with his notes, which infinitely took among all pious and learned men, and as much enraged the monks and friars, and all the fast friends to their dulness and superstition; when men had from reading the Scriptures and Fathers formed in their minds a true notion of the Christian religion and of the government and practices of the ancient Church, and compared that with what they saw in their own age, they wondered at the difference. But then they reflected on the barbarism of the foregoing ages, the gradual encroachments of the Bishop of Rome, the suiting of doctrines and practices to carry on temporal interest, the compliance with the superstitious humours of people, the vast numbers of monks and friars, whose interest lay in the upholding these things; and when they laid these things together, they did not wonder at the degeneracy they saw in the Christian Church. All the difficulty was how to recover the Church out of this state, and this puzzled the wisest men among them. Some thought the ill humours were grown so natural to the body, that it would hazard the state of it to attempt a sudden purging them quite away, and that a violent reformation would do more mischief than good, by popular tumults, by schism and sacrilege. And although such persons saw the corruptions and wished them reformed, yet considering the hazard of a sudden change, they thought it best for particular persons to inform the world better, and so by degrees bring it about, than to make any violent disturbance in the Church. While these things were considered of by wiser men, the Pope goes on to abuse the people with the trade of indulgences; and his officers in Germany were so impudent in this trade, that a bold monk of Wittenberg defies them, and of

a sudden lays open the cheat. And this discovery immediately spread like wild-fire. And so they went on from one thing to another, till the people were enraged at being so long and so grossly abused and tyrannised over. But when reformation begins below, it is not to be expected that no disorders and heats will happen in the management of it. Which gave distastes to such persons as Erasmus was. Which made him like so ill the Wittenberg Reformation, and whatever was carried on by popular tumults. Yet Rosnius saith that the Duke of Saxony, before he would declare himself in favour of Luther, asked Erasmus his opinion concerning him, who gave him this answer: that Luther touched upon two dangerous points, the monk's bellies and the Pope's crown; that his doctrine was true and certain, but he did not approve the manner of his writing. But here in England the Reformation was begun by the consent of the King and the Bishops, who yielded to the retrenchment of the Pope's exorbitant power and the taking away some grosser abuses in Henry VIII.'s time. But in Edward VI.'s time and Queen Elizabeth's, when it was settled on the principles it now stands on, there was no such regard had to Luther or Calvin as to Erasmus and Melanchthon, whose learning and moderation were in greater esteem here than the fiery spirits of the other. From hence things were carried with greater temper; the Church settled with a succession of Bishops, the Liturgy reformed according to the ancient models, some decent ceremonies retained without the follies and superstitions which were before practised, and to prevent the extravagancies of the people in the interpreting of Scripture, the most excellent Paraphrase of Erasmus was translated into English and set up in churches; and to this day Erasmus is in far greater esteem among the divines of our Church than either Luther or Calvin.' Thus far Stillingfleet,[1] whose concluding statement, however, hardly represents quite accurately the prevailing state of opinion at present. Indeed, it appears to me that the character of Erasmus is seldom

---

[1] *Conferences concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome,* II., Works, vol. vi., p. 38.—Ed., London, 1710.

fairly treated by writers upon the Reformation, and that it labours under imputations of personal cowardice and dissimulation which are greatly exaggerated if not wholly undeserved.

In the time immediately preceding the Reformation, and in its earlier stages, Erasmus exercised a sway over the republic of letters such as since him no literary authority has ever exercised, not even Voltaire; though Voltaire's influence upon the mind of Europe is perhaps the nearest parallel that can be given to that of Erasmus. Nor were there wanting considerable points of resemblance between the priest of Rotterdam and the patriarch of Ferney. Both had that astonishing flexibility and versatility of mind which enabled them to suit at once their style and their subject to almost every class of readers and every variety of taste. And both were remarkable for that irresistible power of ludicrous association which seizes on the reader's mind at once, and forces him, whether he will or not, to laugh with the author. But while there were striking points of resemblance, there were no less striking points of contrast between these two wonderful men. I do not reckon among these the circumstance that Erasmus was deeply versed in ancient literature, and that Voltaire had scarcely a schoolboy's acquaintance with it; for this was a merely accidental difference. Voltaire was extensively acquainted with all the literature that was necessary for his purposes; and if he had lived in the same days as Erasmus, when the ancients were the only models in existence for anything like polite composition, and when no man could rise to eminence without an acquaintance with their works, I am sure that the witty Frenchman would have turned as readily and as successfully to classic criticism then, as he did in his own day to the study of Pascal and of Newton.

But it was the moral character of the men which made the great difference. Both were engaged in a fierce warfare against superstition, and ignorance, and intolerance, and both wielded freely, both perhaps too freely, the dangerous weapons of ridicule and sarcasm in that warfare. But Erasmus attacked these enemies as the enemies of true religion, while

Voltaire regarded them as its allies, and aimed his poisoned shafts at Christianity through their sides. And the manner in which Erasmus displayed his unreserved antipathy at once to scepticism and to bigotry, when in doing so he placed in imminent danger the two objects which he is supposed to have valued most, his personal ease and his literary fame, is to my mind a sufficient answer to many of the warm charges which are commonly brought against him. A man so studious of his ease, as Erasmus is sometimes represented to have been, would certainly never have risked that valuable commodity in exasperating against himself the great majority of his own order through Europe by such violent and repeated assaults as he made upon the monastic orders and the Scholastic divinity of his time. His learning and abilities were quite sufficient to gain him all, and more than all, the worldly rank and wealth he ever enjoyed, without leading such a crusade as this; nay, it is evident that this part of his conduct always stood in the way of his promotion, and frequently exposed him to annoyances which were something more than merely negative.

Nor are the losses which he underwent in this way denied by his enemies. His conduct is rather accounted for by supposing that his vanity overbalanced his worldly prudence, and that he willingly sacrificed some share of attainable riches and splendour to obtain the general applause of the learned and the character of the great champion of literature. But were this the true account of the matter, we should find him carefully to abstain from irritating the very persons to whom, on this supposition, he must principally have looked for his reward. He would never in such a case have provoked beyond forgiveness that high and exclusive aristocracy of letters beyond the Alps, who were generally looked up to as the arbiters of taste and dispensers of literary renown. And indeed Erasmus was quite sufficiently covetous of literary fame to make him disposed to shrink from such an undertaking, and it was no small or mean motive which could have urged him to it. But when he saw the interest of his Master's

religion at stake, the same keen pen which had exposed the bigotry of the illiterate monks of Paris was prepared to lay bare the infidelity of the polite courtiers of Leo X., and set them in their true light under the eyes of all Europe. And this he did in his famous Dialogue, the 'Ciceronianus,' the true design of which is commonly misunderstood. At first glance the reader might suppose that he held in his hand a mere satire upon the Italian purists, intended for no higher end than to ridicule a sickly fastidiousness about the style of Latin composition. But in truth its great author had a much graver object in view, and the furious resentment of the powerful personages whom he provoked shows that they well understood how thoroughly he had penetrated their secret. The fact is this: the profligacy of the clergy had produced, as its natural consequence, irreligion. Conscious that it was by trick and imposture their own system was supported, and at the same time ignorant of the true faith and its evidences, they could hardly fail of drawing the inference that Christianity itself was but a gainful delusion; while yet there was something in it (even in the base form it was compelled to wear) that made its awful denunciations against hypocrisy and impurity a heavy burden on its professors. Now consider the effect which the recovery of the old pagan literature, in all the freshness and grace of novelty, must have had upon minds thus prepared. Here they found whatever could encourage their profligate sensuality; here whatever could refine the taste or captivate the fancy. Here were unlocked for them all the treasures of ancient atheism, in its most attractive and elegant disguises. Here they found a popular mythology exactly suited to their purpose, beautiful in its forms, romantic in its fables; not grasping the mind, like Christianity, with a firm and unrelaxing hand, but holding it in airy and elastic fetters; now dazzling the imagination, now exciting the passions, now gratifying the taste, but never touching very sensibly the reason or the conscience—a superstition easy and accommodating in its morality, gay and graceful in its ceremonies, flexible and various in its creed, compatible with

speculations the most daring and irreligious, and pervading with its spirit every drop of that enchanted fountain of the classic literature which had been suddenly opened, and in whose intoxicating streams the mind of Europe was slaking the thirst of ages. In the works of the ancients they found themselves transported to a sort of elysium of elegance and pleasure; and how sordid in comparison with the poets, orators, and historians of the golden age, appeared the thorny Schoolmen, the jingling rhymesters, the clumsy legendaries of the mediæval Church. Here all was mean or mouthing, tawdry or dull; there everything harmonious and engaging. Wearied out by the jargon of the Schools, it was delightful to escape into the clear atmosphere of those sunny regions,

Quas neque concutiunt venti, neque nubila nimbis
Aspergunt, neque nix acri concreta pruinâ,
Cana cadens violat, semperque innubilus æther
Integit, et large diffuso lumine ridet.

In short, the genius of paganism appeared to be on the point of becoming again triumphant in its ancient form; and Erasmus saw with alarm that in the very capital of Christendom, and beside the chair of its first Bishop, the very semblance of a Christian profession was rapidly disappearing, and a deliberate purpose was entertained of laying it as far as possible aside. His sagacity enabled him to see this danger before others; and he no sooner saw it than he pointed it out to the world, and laid his finger on the very princes of the Church as the men from whom it proceeded. But was there then no timidity about Erasmus? I believe there was—and personal timidity too. But timidity and cowardice are different things. Timidity refers to the natural constitution of the mind; cowardice to the practical habit. He who gives way to his timidity against the dictate of honour or conscience is a coward—not he who feels fear without indulging it. Now I am convinced that if Erasmus had felt himself bound to declare openly for the Protestant Reformers, he would have done so, and attacked the Pope as resolutely as he did the

monks. Had his convictions been the same as Melanchthon's, a man in many respects very like him, he would have acted as Melanchthon acted.

But in the first place, Erasmus could not have supported Luther's movement heartily, because he was strenuously opposed to some of the doctrines which that Reformer at first put most prominently forward. The views of Luther, for example, upon the slavery, as he boldly called it, of the human will, were regarded by Erasmus with the utmost alarm as fraught with danger to the very essentials of religion, subversive of all moral responsibility, and full of the seeds of profligacy and atheism. Those who have so severely censured Erasmus for standing aloof from the Lutheran Reformation have never, I think, sufficiently considered this circumstance. They have described Erasmus as a person who, agreeing in his heart, at least in all material points, with the courageous Reformer of Wittenberg, and having it in his power to lend him the most valuable assistance, stood all the while aside, secure from the dangers and turmoil of the battle, which he left Luther to wage alone, for the cause of God and truth against a thousand enemies. This is the picture of Erasmus commonly drawn; and it is of the unfairness of this picture I complain. The fact is that Erasmus did stand aloof at first, while he was doubtful of the principles and spirit of the new movement. But when he seemed to himself to have detected in these what he judged to be irreconcilably opposed to the true genius of Christianity, he no longer merely stood aloof. He came forward again, at the risk of a popularity which he valued very highly, to point out what appeared to him to be the grand error in which the Reformer was involved. And he did this in the way least fitted to win for himself the applause or gratitude of his own Church. He opposed Luther in a grave treatise upon some profound points in metaphysics and theology, addressed to scholars, and only intelligible to scholars. Had he chosen, he could have struck a much severer blow. He might, if he pleased, have dealt with the Lutherans as he had dealt with the monks. There was fund enough for

ridicule in many of the circumstances of their body, and the character and adventures of many of their leaders would have afforded abundant materials for a second part of the Colloquies, which would have set all Europe laughing once again, and atoned in the eyes of good Catholics for the irreverent pleasantries of the earlier part. But such weapons upon such an occasion he voluntarily forewent. Erasmus was a thousand times more charitable and forbearing towards Luther than Luther was towards Erasmus. For in dealing both with Luther and with his opponents, the object of Erasmus was to amend rather than destroy. The existing system and framework of the Church he regarded as things that might be purified and liberalised without being subverted, and therefore he always treated them with respect. The Lutheran movement he regarded as in many ways a wholesome movement, and to some extent in the right direction, and therefore his aim was to regulate rather than to crush it. His wish was to preserve for himself the useful but invidious position of a moderator between the extreme parties, and thus, if possible, bring both to an agreement. In this he failed, and indeed it was impossible but that he should fail. But he did not fail utterly. On the contrary, bitterly as his attack upon Luther was, at the time, resented by that Reformer, it produced ultimately what seems to me a most salutary effect upon him, and still more upon Melanchthon, who soon began to express his dislike of those Stoical disputations (as he called them) about necessity, which the weight of Luther's influence had at first induced him to countenance.

But the grand difference between Erasmus and Luther, considered as Reformers, lay in this, that the Reformation of Erasmus was one beginning from above, that of Luther from below. The first supposed that the time had come when it was possible to effect, by judicious management, a stable and universal reform of the whole Church, without altering the continuity of its visible framework, or departing from its old constitutional authorities and ways of acting. The other had made up his mind for a violent revolution. The timidity of

Erasmus was not at all so much that personal cowardice which has been so coarsely attributed to him, as fear for the whole cause of religion; lest in meddling hastily with the great structure of Church authority the whole edifice of Christendom should fall to ruins. I believe that, in the bottom of his heart, he contemplated a much larger change in the system of Church doctrine, as likely to be the ultimate though gradual effect of his method of reformation, than was ever contemplated by the German Reformer. I say, as likely to be the result, and that word immediately suggests what was perhaps the radical difference between the two great men whom we have been comparing. Erasmus' disposition was sceptical, suspicious, and timid. Luther's peremptory, trustful, and full of hope. Erasmus only doubted many things in the Romish system, which Luther absolutely rejected as not only false but Antichristian; but then he also doubted others which Luther's mind rested upon as rocks of adamant. And it was, I think, the circumstance of the extent of Erasmus' doubts which mainly contributed to make him so cautious.

A vast, a boundless prospect lay before him,
But shadows, clouds, and darkness rested on it.

He dreaded the idea of stepping hastily forward on his own responsibility, and he thought that the Church required much more light, and more purity, before it could be safely urged to discuss and decide questions involving in their issue such a multitude of results as he foresaw must ensue upon them. But while thus doubtful and hesitating about many things, there was one thing about which he had no doubts at all: that the mind of the Church must ultimately review again the whole system of Christian doctrine, and that it was his duty, and the duty of all who could contribute to such a work, to afford it the necessary means and materials for such a review. His life accordingly was devoted to the discharge of that duty. He was the Apostle of Learning, of Peace, and of practical Piety. He was never weary of assailing the enemies of knowledge. He was never weary of inculcating

the lessons of toleration and mutual forbearance; and he finally withdrew from the courts of Popes and Princes, at an age when most men are most covetous of ease and dignity, to spend his later years in a printing house,—not to win fame from the literati by labours upon classic authors, but to bestow upon the world a gift which the Leos, the Bembuses, and the Sadolets never thought of bestowing, though it is the very basis of our religion, the New Testament in its original tongue; and to add to this the chief records of the best and most useful writers of the Primitive Church. Luther's Reformation took its rise from a single point, the assertion of the doctrine of justification by faith; and its original character therefore was the recovery of a dogma. His appeal to private judgment, his rejection of the Pope's dominion, his translation and diffusion of the Bible; these were one after another the consequences of his assertion of that dogma, not the forerunners of it. It was because he felt that he could not give up this particular article of belief, that the memorable words were wrung from him, 'Here I stand—I can do no otherwise—God help me!' It was because the Pope denounced this particular doctrine that therefore Luther denounced him as Antichrist. It was because he read this doctrine in the Scriptures, that he put the Scriptures into all men's hands that they might read it there. The type of Luther's Reformation was taken from what he himself called the true German theology, the *theologia pectoris.* It was not so much the reasonings of the head, as the yearning of a heart for spiritual peace and rest of conscience, which it was unable to find in Romanism, that was the spring of his movements and the origin of his Reformation; and his logical modifications of the doctrines of the Church were things forced upon him by the necessities of his moral wants.

The Reformation of Erasmus, on the other hand, was intended to begin from the intellect. He aimed at imitating the Great Architect of the Universe, and thought that one whole day of the new creation was to be spent in pouring light upon the scene where so vast a work was to be accom-

plished. It is thus that while Luther was patriarch of a particular Church, Erasmus exercised a more Catholic influence, not personal like that of the former, but surviving in the work which he did for all men, for friends and for enemies, and not least felt by those who scorned and detested the name of their benefactor. It is greatly to be regretted that Erasmus never accomplished for himself a work which would have saved much trouble to his apologists, a distinct and detailed account of his own true position and plans. Of such a work we have but one fragment actually executed,—and a kind of adumbration of the rest. Such a work as this he had begun in the shape of three Dialogues upon the affairs of Luther; and of the plan of that work a slight sketch is still preserved among his letters. 'In these Dialogues,' says he, 'Thrasymachus represents Luther, Eubulus takes up the opposite side; the first Dialogue contains an inquiry, whether though everything Luther ever wrote were true, his manner of managing the controversy is expedient. The second Dialogue contains a review and examination of several of his dogmas. The third shows a way by which this tumult may be so allayed as to prevent its readily springing up again. The matter is handled between the two interlocutors without reproaches, without contention, without disguise: the simple and homely truth is proposed nakedly and by itself, with so much equity and moderation that I am much more afraid of provoking the opposite party, who will be apt to construe my gentleness as collusion, than Luther himself, if he has even a single grain of that disposition for which many extol him; if he has, I congratulate him; if he has not, I pray that he may acquire it. I perceive that there are some persons who prefer strong measures, and certainly everyone has a right to be guided by his own judgment. This must be granted, that sternness is the easiest course; but the way which I have indicated appears to me the most salutary. If the disease were confined to a single limb, cautery or amputation might perhaps be useful. But when the evil is diffused over the whole frame, when it pervades the inmost veins and fibres, I apprehend we

need another Mercury, who may gradually expel from the vitals that noxious poison, as he in the fable freed the limbs of Psyche from her deadly slumber. . . . Many interruptions, however, have occurred which have prevented me from making any further progress in the work I have begun than to a single page or two. So that, indeed, it is a work rather planned than begun. But interruptions apart, I have a natural aversion to this kind of writing. I hate fierce debates, and am much more pleased with what is at once innocent and entertaining. Besides, I know well that this matter requires a Hercules, and that I am a very pigmy. On the whole, I have not made up my mind whether I will finish the work or not. Whatever is done, will not be done rashly; nor shall anything be published by me which has not been privately read and approved by those whom it most becomes to be zealous for the glory of Christ. For that is the end for which it will be printed, if printed it ever will be. At present, I perceive that both sides are so inflamed as that each wishes either to conquer wholly or to perish wholly; now the fall of the one will draw with it a fearful ruin of Evangelic truth and liberty; the other cannot be crushed without most pernicious confusion of the whole world, which will involve even the innocent in its consequences. My wish is that matters might be so arranged that each party might yield the victory to truth and the glory of Christ.'[2] 'But what can the end be if the one part hath nothing but tumults, strife, and upbraidings; the other, nothing but censures, bulls, articles, and faggots. Is it a great thing to fling a fellow-mortal, who would die without our help, into the fire?—to teach and to persuade is something really great. Nor let anyone be moved to favour such measures by the recantations he hears of; their real meaning is that the persons who made them chose rather to be put to shame than to be put to death. Bishops should not blush to be the servants of Christian charity, when they have the example of Apostles themselves to encourage them; and learned

---

[2] *Epist. ad Jo. Botzemum*, Append. Jortin's *Life of Erasmus*, vol. ii. p. 439.—EDITORS.

men should not think it an intolerable burden to render due respect to Bishops. This is the advice which I would give to both parties, being myself the slave of neither and the friend of both.'[3]

But Erasmus was very much mistaken if he supposed that some such soft and silvery advice as this was likely to be listened to at such an exciting time. It is the shrill whistle of the boatswain or the clang of the trumpet that alone can direct the movement of masses of men amidst the noise of battle or the tumult of the elements. And, as I said, it was much more through the works of others which he brought to light, that Erasmus exercised a permanent influence upon the Church, than by his own personal authority. As a leader he was soon universally disowned on all sides; and this is not surprising, since it was only to inquiry that he ever undertook to lead. And in the way of stimulating and facilitating inquiry, it is not easy to overestimate the service which he rendered. In particular, the English Church is largely indebted to him. His great patron in England was William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, a man whose name he has made illustrious by the tribute of his gratitude. 'Insigni benignitate me prosequuntur cum alii permulti tum præcipue Mæcenas ille meus unicus, Archiepiscopus Cantuarensis, imo non meus, sed omnium eruditorum inter quos postremas teneo, si modo ullas teneo. Deum immortalem! quam felix, quam fœcundum, quam promptum hominis ingenium! quanta in maximis explicandis negotiis dexteritas! quam non vulgaris eruditio! Tum autem quam inaudita in omnes comitas! quanta in congressu jucunditas, ut quod vere regium est, neminem a se tristem dimittat. Ad hæc quanta quamque alacris liberalitas! Postremo in tanta fortunæ dignitatisque præcellentia quam nullum supercilium! ut solus ipse magnitudinem suam ignorare videatur. In amicis tuendis nemo neque fidelior, neque constantior. In summâ vere Primas est, non solum dignitate, verum et in omni genere laudis.'[4]

Such was Warham's character, and with such a character

---

[3] *Spongia*, apud Jortin, i. p. 318. [4] Apud Jortin, i. p. 40.

the faults of his successor, Wolsey, must have been doubly glaring. But Warham was passing off the scene when Erasmus' influence began to be strongly felt in England. The men through whom he chiefly influenced the English Church directly, were Colet, Tonstal, and More. But to him indirectly as the reviver of the study of the Scriptures and primitive antiquity, we trace almost all the principal confessors and martyrs in the reign of Henry VIII., Bilney and Tyndale, Barnes and Frith, and others whom it is unnecessary to enumerate. If we look at the men whom Erasmus influenced directly, we shall see that they were all sensible of the necessity and anxious for the commencement of a reformation. But it was a reformation after Erasmus' plan. 'We see,' says Dean Colet, in his celebrated sermon before the Convocation,—'we see strange and heretical notions appear in our days. But there is no heresy more dangerous than the lives of profligate priests. Wherefore ye fathers,—ye priests,—ye clergy, all of you—awake from this lethargy of worldliness, and listen to the Apostle when he cries, "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewal of your minds." Now this reformation, this renovation of the ecclesiastical state, must begin from you, our spiritual fathers, and thence be derived to us, your priests; to you we look, as to the standards which are to direct us, in you and in your life we would read, as it were in living books, the manner in which we ought to live. Wherefore, if you wish to scan our motes, first pluck the beam out of your own eyes. There is,' he goes on to say, 'no fault for which our fathers have not provided sufficient remedies. We need not to have new laws made, but the old kept.'[5] It is plain then, that the Reformation which Colet looked forward to, was one which would not have carried matters much further than one which Bossuet himself would have contemplated with satisfaction. Warham, and he and More, and Tonstal, were all zealous for a reformation of discipline and morals; they were all anxious to

---

[5] Some of these sentences will be found in Burnet's Abstract of the Sermon, *Hist. Ref.*, part I. B. iii. vol. iii. pp. 38-40, Ed. Nares.—EDITORS.

liberalise as far as possible the existing institutions of the Church, to throw its existing dogmas into the most intelligible and rational form possible, and even to allow great latitude of sentiment and discussion to the learned, and to tolerate many errors in the unlearned, if they would only keep those errors to themselves. Their spirit in this respect was pithily expressed by More himself when his son-in-law, Roper, then tinged with the new opinions, sought to obtain a licence to preach. 'What!' said the Chancellor, 'is it not enough that your friends should know you for a fool, but you must go and tell it to the world?'

Thus far then, as I have said, reformers they undoubtedly were. But they laboured, like Erasmus and some of the old French aristocracy, under the unhappy prejudice that revolutions might be made with rosewater. And from the moment that schism appeared inevitable, from the moment that the populace were addressed, from the moment that the learning which they had themselves diffused and the free inquiry which they had themselves stimulated, began to produce the effects which they cannot but produce in such a soil as human nature, these men became alarmed at the work of their own hands, and sought, according as their temper was more or less stern, by measures more or less severe to crush it. The transition in Sir Thomas More's case from the latitudinarian philosopher of the 'Utopia' to the bigoted persecutor who flogged heretics himself in his own garden at Chelsea, has often excited the wonder of the students of history.[6] But after all, as Mr. Dugald Stewart has very well observed, we have had almost in our own days many parallels to the case of Sir Thomas More. How many of those who were at first most ardent in the cause of the earlier French Revolution, became in a short time its bitterest and least discriminating opponents, and from thenceforth could see nothing in the cause of liberty, wherever it appeared, but the fruitful source of similar excesses.

---

[6] See the history of James Bainham in Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, I. ii. vol. i pp. 269-73, Ed. Nares.—EDITORS.

If we believe himself, it was similar causes which made More a persecutor. We have amongst his works a most ingenious and highly entertaining defence of his consistency in this matter. It is a dialogue between himself and a young gospeller, in which the gospeller claims toleration for the new opinions, and More explains his reasons for denying it. And those reasons are wholly drawn from the danger to the state which ecclesiastical revolutions are always found by experience to bring with them; from the consequences dangerous to morality, which he elaborately deduces at great length; from some of Luther's strong and unqualified Solifidian statements; from the excesses of the Anabaptist insurgents; and from the Antinomian practice and principles which could not be denied to prevail amongst too many Protestants. It is no wonder that those who viewed these things from without should have looked upon them with distrust and dismay, when we know that many of the leaders of the Reformation themselves were tempted almost to despair, when they found themselves surrounded with such terrible phenomena.

'The authority of the ministers,' says Capito, 'is wholly abolished; all is lost; all falls to ruin. There is not any Church amongst us, not so much as one where there is any discipline; the people, accustomed to and nourished in licentiousness, have rejected the curb altogether; as if by destroying the power of the Papists we at the same time destroyed the force of the sacraments and the ministry. They loudly tell us, "I know enough of the gospel; what need have I of your aid to find out Jesus Christ? Go preach to those that are disposed to hear you!"'

Men failed to perceive that the disturbances which alarmed them were not so much the result of private judgment itself, as of the very system which they were seeking to uphold. It was because men's faith had been so long based entirely upon the authority of the Church, it was therefore that when that authority was rudely shaken, the whole body of Christian doctrine, the whole integrity of Christian practice, were exposed to such dangerous hazard. They argued like the

drunkard who should charge the inconveniences of a lately begun abstinence upon his brief reformation rather than upon his long-continued inebriety—like the captive who should complain of the sun and of the air for making the eyes weak and the limbs faint, and choose to return to the cell and the fetters where he had languished out his life.

We must cherish in ourselves a confidence in the destiny of truth, which shall rest firmly upon the promise of God, and not upon the shifting appearances of events, if we would maintain our minds in any tolerable tranquillity, while seeking really and sincerely to discharge the obligations which lie upon us.

There are some who seem to have hardly any other measure of truth than that which is derived from the experience of what actually commends itself to the minds of men. Let this not be our measure. We may be sure that truth will triumph, but we cannot be sure that what triumphs is truth. And, indeed, if we looked only to experience, however it may be plain that truth has a tendency to triumph, as the planets have a tendency to fly off at a tangent, experience also shows us so many and such unlooked for checks upon this tendency of truth, that in a gloomy hour one is often tempted to conjecture that the final triumph of truth may be as distant now as it ever was. At such hours a man is strongly tempted to cease from struggling with the stream, and rather wish, as Hooker says, that the world may go well so as it be not long of us, than with pain and hazard make ourselves advisers for the common good. At such times it requires something shorter and more certain than the intricate disquisitions of philosophy to set us cheerfully at work in behalf of what may appear a failing cause.

LECTURE V.

THE REAL BASIS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Gentlemen,—The position of Erasmus in relation to the great Protestant movement, which I was treating of in my last lecture, may be compared to that of Socrates in relation to the later Greek philosophy. Socrates himself founded no school. But all the schools of philosophy which sprang up after him owed their origin to his exertions, and to the impulse which he had given to human thought. He was himself very little of a dogmatist, and it was, we learn from that curious Dialogue, the Clitopho, a complaint made of him in his own time, that when he had raised an earnest desire after truth in his scholars' minds, he had little or nothing to offer in the way of satisfying that desire.

Erasmus was, I believe, scarcely more of a dogmatist than Socrates. But though he had no system of his own to propound, he was more fortunate than the Athenian in this respect, that he was able at least to lay before men the teaching of a higher Master, and show them where they might seek the wisdom which cometh from above. This he did by his noble efforts to place the Greek Testament within the reach of all, and to revive a knowledge of the original languages of Scripture and the rational canons of interpretation.

In effect, he did to a great extent for theology what Bacon did for natural science. He led men to seek at once in Scripture itself the meaning of those terms which had passed into the current language of the Schools, and to use the just principles of criticism as their organ in this investi-

gation. And he obtained his purpose perhaps the more effectually because he did this in a way least apt to give alarm at first. He was, he said, a grammarian, not a theologian. The tradition of the Church was a large field upon which he did not choose to enter. He was concerned only with the literal sense of Scripture and its true readings; and the meaning of any particular text in the Bible had always been allowed to be an open question in the Church, so long as no dogma was controverted by it.

By his advice accordingly, a great number of minds throughout Europe were brought into immediate contact with the inspired volume, and placed as it were at the very feet of Christ's own Apostles, speaking in their own words the same divine lessons as fifteen hundred years before had given doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction to the disciples whom they had themselves gathered into the fold. And the result was soon found to be—what the result always is, and must always be, of an intelligent study of the Scriptures on a large scale,—dissatisfaction with the dominant teaching of the Roman Church. It is accordingly to Erasmus and his Greek Testament that we trace almost all the Protestant confessors and martyrs of the reign of Henry VIII. To this source in particular we trace the labours of Bilney, Frith, and Tyndale, and it was by the labours of the last of these, the martyr William Tyndale, that the Testament which Erasmus gave to the learned became, in the shape of an English version, a household book in England. By the labours of these men, and such as these, the doctrines of Protestantism soon made amazing progress amongst the mass of the people, and especially among the middle classes; and the history of their work is certainly much more properly the history of the English Reformation in Henry VIII.'s time than the chronicle of suits for divorce, judicial murders, and political intrigues, which commonly passes under that name.

Among the illustrious band who then stood in the forefront of our Reformation, there is none to whose memory my own mind turns with greater respect and wonder than Frith,

whose works, considering the time when they were written, the age of their author (for he was but in his twenty-fourth year when he was martyred), and the circumstances under which they were composed, have always appeared to me in every way the most remarkable writings of that eventful reign. The vigour of style, the force of reasoning, the perpetual buoyancy of spirit, the playful wit, which support the reader's attention all through, exceed, I think, the happiest efforts of his great antagonist, Sir T. More; and when we remember that More was a ripe and practised scholar, writing at his ease, with all the comforts of life and all the appliances of learning at hand, and then read Frith's account of his own circumstances, we shall be the more surprised. 'Truth to say,' observes the poor confessor, 'we play not at even hand. For I am in a manner as a man bound to a post, and cannot so well bestow me in my play as if I were at liberty. For I may not have such books as are necessary for me, neither yet pen, ink, nor paper, but only secretly, so that I am in continual fear both of my lieutenant and of my keeper, lest they should espy any such thing in me; and therefore it is little marvel though the work be imperfect, for whensoever I hear the keys ring at the doors, straight all must be conveyed out of the way, and then if any notable thing had been in my mind, it was clean lost; and therefore I beseech the good reader count it as a thing born out of season, which for many causes cannot have its perfect form and shape, and pardon me my rudeness and imperfection.'

But it is not his literary powers, wonderful as they were, which are the thing best worth our attention in the case of Frith; what is still more admirable is an excellence of a far higher nature—I mean that heavenly moderation which is so seldom found united with a zeal and firmness like his. In a paper which he drew up shortly before his execution, he has given us an account of the articles wherefore John Frith died, in which after relating the dispute which he held with his judges upon the subject of Transubstantiation, he goes on to say—'I think many men wonder how I can die in this

article, seeing that it is no necessary article of our faith, for I grant that neither part is an article necessary to be believed under pain of damnation, but leave it as a thing indifferent, to think therein as God shall instil in every man's mind, and that neither part condemn other for this matter, but receive each other in brotherly love, reserving each other's infirmity to God. The cause of my death is this: because I cannot in conscience abjure and swear that our prelates' opinion of the Sacraments is an undoubted article of the faith necessary to be believed under pain of damnation. Now though this opinion were indeed true (which they can never prove), yet could I not in conscience grant that it should be an article of faith, for there are many verities which yet may be no such articles. It is true that I lay in irons when I wrote this, howbeit I would not have you to receive this truth for an article of your faith, for you may think the contrary without all jeopardy of damnation. The cause why I cannot believe their opinion of transmutation is this: 1. Because I think verily that it is false, and can neither be proved by Scripture nor faithful doctors if they be well pondered. 2. The second cause is this: because I will not bind the congregation of Christ by mine example to admit any necessary article beside our creed, and specially none such as cannot be proved true by Scripture. And I say that the Church, as they call it, cannot compel us to receive any such articles to be of necessity under pain of damnation. 3. The third cause is: because I dare not be so presumptuous in entering into God's judgment as to make the prelates in this point a necessary article of our faith, for then I should damnably condemn all the Germans and Almains with infinite woe, which indeed do not believe nor think that the substance of bread and wine is changed into the substance of Christ's natural body. And surely I cannot be so foolish hardy as to condemn such an infinite number for our prelates' pleasures. Thus all the Germans and Almains, both of Luther's side and also of Œcolampadius, do wholly approve my matter. And surely I think there is no man that hath a pure conscience, but he will think that I

did righteously: for that this transubstantiation should be a necessary article of the faith, I think no man can say it with a good conscience although it were true indeed.'[1]

Such were the genuine sentiments and such the spirit of the leading men who laid the corner stone of our Reformation in the time of Henry VIII.; and you will remember that it is to them we are justified in looking back as the originators of the great work, much more than to the tyrannical or time-serving politicians who have too commonly filled that place in the eyes of mankind which the martyrs and confessors of the reformed faith should have occupied. But the truth is that what was accomplished by the mere force of authority at that time was a work which derived all its stability from forces extraneous to itself—from the labours of those very men whom in its blindness it did everything in its power to crush. For I think it is manifest that an ecclesiastical system such as that of Henry VIII. could not possibly have rested on any secure basis, and would not probably have outlasted a single generation, if the other states of Christendom had not followed precisely the example which he had set them; and there were no reasonable grounds whatever for hoping that they would. My reason for that opinion seems an obvious one, and is this—that so long as men are left to determine themselves by the mere authority of present visible guides, they will naturally follow those guides who have the greatest apparent claims to such an authority; and that when, in balancing authority, without any appeal to a superior test, men come to weigh in opposite scales the authority of the priesthood through all the rest of Europe against the authority of the priesthood of their own particular Church, they cannot avoid feeling that the preponderance of weight is in favour of the former. For a while, the people of England might have been satisfied to follow blindly their own bishops, to whom they had so long been accustomed to look as the authorised organs of the Catholic Church, even when those

---

[1] The particulars relating to Frith will be found in Fox, *Book of Martyrs.*

bishops separated themselves from the visible communion of the great body of Christians in the West. And if, as I have said, after a time the other Churches of Christendom had followed the example of England, renouncing, like it, the Pope's usurped dominion, but retaining otherwise the same system of doctrine, or something like the same system of doctrine, as men had been previously accustomed to receive—then in the West as in the East, a Church might have subsisted without a Papacy on the basis of mere ecclesiastical authority. But all things considered, this was an event not to be expected, and certainly one which did not take place in fact. If, then, no other foundation for popular belief had been substituted for that of mere authority, the question could not have been avoided, Shall we follow the prelates of a single country who have cut themselves off from communion with the rest of Europe, or the great body of Christian bishops through the rest of that vast continent who continue to yield submission to the successor of St. Peter? And I think there can be no doubt that, with no other and higher elements to guide their decision, men would generally have decided in favour of the latter alternative. What the labours of the Reformers contributed was another and a higher element, namely the authority of God's written word, to aid men in determining this vital question. Without this I can hardly think that the National Church of England could have maintained its independent position for a single generation, and with it, it is equally manifest that it could not be contented with merely maintaining its independent position. 'Hast thou appealed unto Scripture,' was at once the natural cry of the people, 'unto Scripture shalt thou go;' and when this unerring test—this Lydian stone—was once placed in their hands, it was not merely the Pope's supremacy, but the whole system of current Church doctrine that was examined by it. Except, then, for the new foundation which the true Reformers were gradually preparing for it, by making the appeal to such an authority as Scripture rendered accessible to the whole body of Christians, and submitted to

their private judgment, the mere political Reformation of Henry VIII. would have been what Livy calls 'res unius ætatis,' a thing as unstable and transitory in its nature as the schismatical position which the Gallican Church occupied for a brief space in the reign of Louis XIV.; while again, in order that the edifice which Henry left behind him should really rest effectively upon the new foundation, and derive available support from it, it was equally necessary that a large mass of the outlying structures which spoiled its symmetry and afforded shelter to its assailants should be removed.

It may appear to some, indeed, that this immediate resort to Scripture might have been avoided, and a sufficiently strong basis of Church authority provided in another way. And, in point of fact, two other courses have at various times been adopted, though with little success. Nor is it, I think, any hard matter to show that no success can be reasonably expected from them.

In the first place it might, at first sight, appear possible to bring in the authority of the Eastern to overbalance that of the Western Church. A particular Western Church, it may be said, by uniting itself intimately with the great Christian body in the East, would gain the appearance of connection with a society as ancient and nearly as extensive as that which holds communion with the See of Rome. This expedient suggested itself at a very early period to the Lutherans, whose negotiations with the Patriarch Jeremiah form a very curious portion of their history; and again to the Nonjurors at a later period, of whose attempts—very unfortunate ones—to establish a friendly union with the Greek prelates, you will find an account in Mr. Lathbury's history of that schism.

But such an attempt could never be successful, least of all in the sixteenth century. The Eastern Church was far too remote and inaccessible to afford men the semblance of a visible authority, even if such a union with it could have been effected. And such a union could never have been effected without submitting to terms almost as humiliating as the

Pope himself would have exacted. We should have appeared at the feet of the Oriental Patriarchs in the garb of penitents seeking for readmission into the Unity of the Catholic Church—seeking for this high privilege from a poor and ignorant and down-trodden priesthood, who yet, amidst rags and beggary, retained the same haughty and intolerant spirit as possessed Photius in all his splendour, when he hurled his anathemas from the shadow of the imperial throne. We should have altered the very symbol of faith which our children had been taught from their youth up as the very cognizance of Christians; and such a proceeding would therefore have involved the very thing which was so carefully avoided at the time we speak of—a noticeable change in the doctrine of the Church. And I may add that the surrender of the clause 'Filioque' in the Creed would have been a change from which it is probable that Henry and his divines would have themselves shrunk with as much horror as from a surrender of the tenet of Transubstantiation. Even as late as the reign of James I., when the authority of the Easterns was appealed to in presence of that learned and orthodox monarch, his Majesty was pleased to pronounce oracularly, that the Greek Church had sinned against the Holy Ghost, and was therefore abandoned by him.

But why, it may be asked, might not a stable basis have been found in the authority of the ancient Church, whose decisions have come down to us in the writings of the Fathers? The answer is obvious. Such a course would have been attended—and, so far as it was practised was attended—with all the same disadvantages as an appeal to Scripture, without any of its counterbalancing convenience.

The agreement of a particular Church with the whole of a great organised society under a visible Head, existing before men's eyes, is a thing which it requires no learning to discover. Everyone understands at once, that if any disagreement had sprung up there would soon be manifest tokens of it—warnings and admonitions from the central government sufficient to put the most careless on their

guard. But the agreement of a particular Church with the Church of the past is by no means so easily discoverable. The Doctors and Councils of the past must be looked for to be found, and that in places where it is not easy for the mass of mankind to prosecute the search. To appeal to them, then, is to acknowledge that the teaching of the present Church cannot always be implicitly relied upon; it is to grant that that teaching requires to be tried by a test, and a test much more difficult for the unlearned to find and to understand, than the Scripture. It is to allow that the teaching of the present Church ought, like paper-money, to be convertible into something else, but to make copper farthings a legal tender, so that one would require a horse and dray to draw home the change of a large bill.

The writings of the Fathers can never be a practicable immediate basis of faith to the mass of the people, because they are not accessible to the mass of the people. The great majority of the members of the Church must needs take on trust from the more learned the several values, and the general result, of the documents which are supposed to deliver down to us the judgment of antiquity, and receive that judgment from the report of others. Here then again, therefore, the question will return, by whose reports are they to be guided? For they will very soon discover that men equally learned with, and far more numerous than, the Doctors of their own Church, give very different reports of the nature of that judgment from what they receive from their own spiritual guides. In the beginning of the Reformation, indeed, when the whole body of the wit and learning of Europe appeared disposed to take one side against the Pope, there might seem to be a sufficient consent of learned men to justify the unlearned in concluding that his claims had no foundation in antiquity. But this state of things, you know, did not long continue. Rome soon began to use those weapons against her assailants which they had employed against herself. And a Church which could boast the possession of a Bellarmine, a Baronius, a Petavius, and a hundred more, could no longer

be looked down upon as a mere asylum of ignorance and stupidity.

And besides this, the question would immediately occur, why, if the ancient Church had this authority, the modern Church did not possess the like? The ancient Church was once the present Church; if we are bound by the decisions of the Council of Ephesus, it cannot be reasonably maintained that the men, who lived at the time when the Council of Ephesus was held, were not bound by its decisions in the same manner and to the same extent. It is not surely by age that the canons of that Council have acquired their force. For if so, the decrees of many a synod would come to be binding only then, when the change of circumstances had rendered them superfluous.

But if the ancient Church was once a living, speaking, visible authority to the men of its own generation, what has become in ours, it would be asked, of that living, speaking, visible authority? And where are we to fix the period when such an authority ceased to exist?

If we appeal to the writings of the ancient Fathers as mere documents of historical evidence representing to us, with various degrees of value as evidence, the unauthoritative historical tradition of the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles, we may find in them a consistent and tenable ground from which the decisions of the present Church may be assailed. But if we regard them as records of an authoritative teaching, a teaching which is to be received on its own word with an implicit faith, as the voice of the indwelling Spirit speaking through its organ, the visible Church, we place ourselves at a manifest disadvantage by conceding, and that apparently merely to suit our own convenience, an authority to the Church of the past, which we deny to the Church of the present.

If the teaching of the Church of this generation may be erroneous, is it not manifest that the teaching of the Church of the last generation may have been erroneous too? And the same doubt, it is evident, will still continue to cling to each

age of the Church as we follow back the line through the previous generations of mankind?

For these and many other reasons, such a system of Anglicanism as Henry VIII. established, and such as since his time has been at different intervals sought to be established by others, was not, and cannot be expected to be, a permanent system. In effect, I believe that it has never been established without the hope of its example being soon followed by the great body of Christendom; and when this hope is disappointed, the necessity soon becomes obvious, of either providing a different basis from mere authority for the system, and consequently modifying it so as to suit that basis, or else of abandoning it altogether.

The true position of the Church of England is to furnish in itself a point of union between the other reformed and the other hitherto unreformed Churches. But by approaching too near to either of them, we should entirely sacrifice that position. By our retention of the Episcopal order we have secured to ourselves an advantage, the loss of which placed the Protestant bodies of the Continent under difficulties from which they were never able to extricate themselves, and made the thought of a direct union with them repulsive to the habitual feeling of the great majority of the Christians throughout Europe and Asia. By retaining it, we have retained what may, at any favourable juncture, prove a bond of union between ourselves and any continental Church which may at any time, like us, be led to throw off the dominion of Rome. We furnish thus a rallying point for all who may at any time be disposed to break that yoke from off their necks.

But if, while seeking to commend ourselves to the feelings and habits of the unreformed Churches of Christendom, we were to sacrifice the common basis of Protestantism, this would be indeed to throw away the jewel for the casket, and make our present isolated position not only logically untenable, but even visibly absurd. For, on the foot of mere authority, there can be no question that men will ever prefer the Pope to the King—a Pope at Rome to a Pope at Lam-

beth—and the Church of Europe to the mere insular Church of the British Islands. The political Reformation then of Henry VIII. is to be considered as the mere husk or shell of the true Reformation which was contained within it, and which could not germinate and throw up its stem without breaking the case in which it was enclosed. The system of Henry VIII. wanted intelligible principles to support it; and when an intelligible principle for the separate position of the British Church was provided, it became necessary to modify that system in conformity with this principle. And what I wish you to observe is, that as Protestantism is essentially based upon an appeal, not to mere authority, but to historic evidence, therefore it is that education and learning are absolutely necessary to its existence.

LECTURE VI.

INFLUENCE OF GERMAN PROTESTANTISM ON THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Gentlemen,—Though the Reformation in England had, as I have endeavoured to show, an independent origin of its own in the study of the Scriptures themselves, yet it was not possible in the nature of things that it should continue long unaffected by the contemporaneous movement going on in Germany under the influence of Luther and Melanchthon. It was but natural that the English Reformers should have been drawn by sympathy towards men in so many respects like themselves, and should have sought for counsel and aid from persons so well qualified to afford them both. And this the rather because the greater success at first of the German Reformers, and the patronage they obtained from some of the most powerful princes of the Empire, enabled them to afford a secure asylum to their British friends when driven by persecution from their own shores. It was thus through the aid of foreign Protestants that Tyndale was enabled to complete and print his translation of the New Testament into English; and though it is doubtful whether he ever met and conversed personally with Luther, yet there can be no doubt of his great obligations to the writings of that great man. Indeed we often come upon passages in Tyndale which, for many pages together, are mere versions out of the works of Luther or Melanchthon. And the same may be said of almost all the English writers on the Protestant side in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. Meanwhile, however, one thing is worth remarking, that much

as they were in other matters influenced by Luther, there was, I think, not one of the English Reformers, with the exception of Barnes, who adopted Luther's peculiar view of the doctrine of the Eucharist. The truth seems to be that Luther's dogma of Consubstantiation was soon felt even by many of his immediate adherents to be a grotesque incongruity in their system, which could not be made to harmonise with the general tenor of Protestant teaching; and I think it is plain enough that Melanchthon would very early have thrown it off openly, if the dread of Luther's anger, and still more, reluctance to give his old master pain, had not held him back from taking so bold a step. For it was a favourite dogma with Luther, one upon the maintenance of which his whole heart—and what a heart!—was set. And as the very weakness of a deformed or silly child makes him sometimes the especial object of his parents' regard, so it would really seem that in proportion as this dogma was unlike all the rest of the vigorous offspring of the great Reformer's mind, in proportion as it excited the disgust of his friends and the ridicule of his enemies, in the same proportion it became dearer and dearer to his affections. In his intolerant zeal for forcing all men to the profession of a dogma which he was himself unable to state consistently, he was content to weaken the Reformation, at its very first rise, by an incurable schism; and by stamping this indelibly upon the professed creed of his own Churches, he did more to hamper and impair their activity than a thousand Eckiuses or Cochlæuses could have done by their opposition. The English Protestants fortunately were under no such bondage to the vehement Reformer of Wittenberg, as that under which Melanchthon often groaned. And they, as I have said, from the first showed scarcely any disposition to adopt the peculiar Lutheran view of the Eucharist. In other respects, however, the teaching of Luther undoubtedly exercised a very great influence upon the English mind in the reign of Henry VIII., through the writings of our native Reformers, who without naming their author, drew largely upon his works. Nor are we to suppose that it was

through any vain desire of gaining for themselves the credit of Luther's compositions, that men who were hazarding their lives for the cause of truth, thus used his writings without acknowledgment. Literary reputation was indeed the very last thing in their thoughts, and their sole object was to diffuse sound doctrine, by whomsoever spoken. But there was an obvious reason why Luther's name should have been suppressed. That name would have at once awakened suspicion in many a breast which readily received his lessons as long as the teacher was unknown. It was a name which would have given great and needless alarm to many of their English fellow-subjects, and it was a name peculiarly hateful to Henry himself, who could never forgive the savage ferocity with which the Monk of Wittenberg had treated the theological speculations of the King of England. The hope that Henry might be won ere long to a true and thorough reformation never seems to have abandoned the English Protestants. They saw that the corruptions of Romanism were every day losing their hold upon the popular mind, and that a bold movement on the part of the prince was all that was required to give that system of superstition its deathblow in England; and hence they were studious in every possible way to avoid provoking his irritable temper. No doubt Luther must often have bitterly regretted the violence with which he had so indecently attacked a sovereign whom it would have been so important to make his friend:

> Turno tempus erit magno quum optaverit emptum
> Intactum Pallanta, et quum spolia ista diemque
> Oderit.

Nor was this one of the least injuries which his ungovernable temper inflicted on the cause of the Reformation.

But in the reign of Edward VI. there was no longer any impassable barrier between the English Court and the heads of the Lutheran Church in Germany. There were rather peculiar circumstances which brought them into a closer connection with England than any other of the foreign divines.

In the first place, the Lutheran Church had no antipathy to the Episcopal constitution which was retained so carefully in England. Luther had impressed upon his followers a type of doctrine, but not a type of polity. Such arrangements for Church government as he had made in Germany were at first regarded merely as provisional, and rendered necessary by the exigency of the case. 'The Churches,' says the Confession of Augsburg, 'do not demand that the Bishops should sacrifice their own dignity for the sake of concord, but only that they should remit the unequal burdens which have been newly imposed, and are contrary to the customs of the Catholic Church. The thing aimed at is not to wrest their authority from the Bishops, but only that they should suffer the gospel to be preached in its purity, and should relax a few observances which cannot be kept without sin. If they will not consent to do this, they should consider how they can answer it to God for being through their obstinacy the occasions of a schism.'

This document spoke the general sense of all the Lutherans, but the expressions of Melanchthon himself in his private letters were still more strong. 'Would to God,' he exclaims, 'that I could confirm not the sovereignty of Bishops, but restore their administration; for I see what kind of Church we are likely to have if we subvert the ecclesiastical government. I see that tyranny will be more insupportable than ever.' 'If there were not Bishops,' he says elsewhere, 'in the Church, it would be necessary to create them.'

It is remarkable, too, that just the same dispute about rites and ceremonies, as began in Edward VI.'s reign to agitate the English, sprang up still earlier in the Lutheran Church. It was called among the Lutherans the Adiaphoristic Controversy, or the dispute about things indifferent. And in that controversy Melanchthon took precisely the same view as was taken by the governors of the English Church, maintaining the lawfulness of those customary practices, such as the sign of the cross, the wearing of a surplice, &c., which were not

in themselves superstitious, however they were abused to superstition.

In both Churches alike, this controversy seems to have originated in a natural reaction against Romanism carried to extremes

And it is, I think, a great mistake to suppose that scruples about vestments and usages in the English Church had their origin in continental influence, or should be traced to their source in the famous troubles at Frankfort during Mary's reign. Hooper's dispute with Ridley on this subject is plain proof that such a notion, however popular, is incorrect. And the truth is that those who fall into this error overlook a most important distinction between the earlier and the later oppositions to these indifferent things. At first they were resisted merely as badges of Popery, as indissolubly connected with the superstitions of Rome, and likely to foster or revive them in men's minds, or, as men became more and more unreasonably exasperated against them, as things which had contracted some kind of impurity by their inveterate abuse. On some such grounds as these, Coverdale and Hooper appear to have refused to wear the old Episcopal ornaments. But while the Puritans, properly so called, the party in the Church whose origin can be distinctly traced to Geneva, retained these old objections, they seem to have retained them principally as popular points of opposition. For their own ground was a much deeper one—the denial to the Church or Magistrate to make any determination about things indifferent in religious worship, to institute any rites or ceremonies whatever, not commanded by the written word of God. This was a tenet which does not, I think, appear to have prevailed in the English Church until after the Marian persecution.

But to return: it is easy to see how congenial such a mind as Melanchthon's must have been to a man of the cautious temper of Archbishop Cranmer, and therefore it is not surprising that Cranmer should have referred so frequently as the correspondence given by Strype shows him to have done, to Luther's friend and successor for counsel and advice.

It is to be remembered, too, that it was not merely the successful conduct of the Reformation in England which at this time employed Cranmer's powerful mind. There was a much larger and grander scheme before him, the uniting by means of the English Church the whole body of the Reformed in one communion, and composing the unhappy differences which Luther's impetuosity had produced between the German and Swiss Protestants. His letters to Alasco, to Bullinger, to Calvin, and to Melanchthon incontestably establish this; and without bearing this in mind we shall not be in a just position to take a correct view of those documents of our Church, in the preparation of which Cranmer bore the principal part.

But even if we had not direct evidence in this way of the influence of Melanchthon, through Cranmer, on the English Reformation, the documents to which I refer would of themselves be sufficient to show it. Let us look, for example, at the first draft of the Articles as they were set forth in the reign of Edward VI., and compare it with the Confession of Augsburg, and with Melanchthon's other writings, and we shall see that these generally furnish its groundwork, and that where it varies from them, it for the most part so varies in omitting some doubtful or delicate points, which Melanchthon himself would have omitted if his design had been, like Cranmer's, to reunite the parties of the Reformation, rather than to clear himself and his immediate friends from the charge of heresy brought against them by the Romanists.

The first Article is:—There is but one living and true God, and He is everlasting; without body, parts, or passions: of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness: the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Now this is almost word for word a version into English of the first Article of the Confession of Augsburg.

'Docent,' say the Augustan confessors, 'quod sit unus

Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, immensâ potentiâ, sapientiâ, bonitate, creator et conservator omnium visibilium et invisibilium, et tamen tres sint personæ ejusdem essentiæ, potentiæ, et coeternæ, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.' There is added in the Augsburg Confession a definition of the word Person, which is carefully avoided in the English article, and we know that, as he grew older, Melanchthon came to be more and more reluctant to enter upon such abstruse points of theology, and to shrink with alarm from anything which might suggest discussions of them. 'Good God!' he exclaims in one of his letters, 'what tragedies will this question about the Trinity one day excite in the Church? I betake myself to those passages of Scripture which bid us invoke Christ, which is giving Him the honour of Deity, and a thing full of consolation; but minute inquiries into the precise definition of the Persons and their differences are things not very edifying.'[1]

But to proceed: the next Article is in the same way a literal translation of the third Article of the Augsburg Confession, but those parts which refer only to matters on which almost all Christians were agreed are less remarkable. Let us look forward to some others. 'Sacraments,' say King Edward's Articles, 'ordained by the word of God, be not only tokens or badges of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.'

In comparing this with the Augsburg Confession, we see a remarkable agreement combined with a very significant variation.

'Sacramenta instituta sunt, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proponenda.' You see that the English statement, 'by which He doth work invisibly in us,'

---

[1] Lib. iv. *Ep.* 140, apud Jortin's *Life of Erasmus*, vol. i. p. 186.—EDITORS.

has nothing corresponding to it in the Latin. Indeed it might be held, consistently with the Augustan Article, that the Sacraments excite and confirm faith only by making to the eye the same promise as a preacher's voice might address to the ear. Again, in the Article on ministering in the congregation there is an important addition. In the Augsburg Confession it is merely said, 'quod nemo debeat in Ecclesiâ publicè docere aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi ritè vocatus.' The English Article adds the important clause that 'we ought to judge those lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation;' the object plainly being to meet the pretence that a mere inward call was sufficient to justify a man in assuming the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. A comparison of the seventh Article of Augsburg with those of Edward is also worth making.

It runs thus: 'Est Ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in quâ Evangelium rectè docetur, et rectè administrantur Sacramenta. Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiæ satis est consentire de doctrinâ Evangelii et administratione Sacramentorum; nec necesse est ubique esse similes traditiones humanas, seu ritus et cærimonias ab hominibus institutas.'

In the English this is broken into two, which are separated by a considerable interval.

'The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same;' and then after twelve other Articles comes the rest. 'It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly alike.' The English, you see, is in some respects fuller than the Lutheran statement. It is careful to state that the Church of which it speaks is the visible Church, and to explain the *rectè* of the Augsburg Confession as referred to the Sacraments so as not to require absolute perfection in the mode of ministering them, but only the observance of everything expressly ordained by Christ.

For a statement of the doctrine of justification the Articles of Edward refer us to the Homily, which is now known to have been drawn up by Cranmer, and is accordingly printed as one of his compositions in all the modern editions of his works. It is the Homily on the Salvation of Mankind. But I do not perceive that any of his late editors have pointed out how largely it borrows its statements from the writings of Melanchthon.

'This sentence,' says the Homily, 'that we be justified by faith only, is not so meant that the said justifying faith is alone in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread and the fear of God, at any time and season. But this saying that we be justified by faith only, freely and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works; . . . and therefore wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification to Christ only. . . . Justification is not the office of man, but of God; for man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part nor in whole. . . . The true understanding of this doctrine, we be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves); but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word and believe, although we have faith, hope, charity, &c., we must renounce the merit of all such virtues.'

Now can anyone doubt that, when he wrote this, Melanchthon's 'Commonplaces' lay before Cranmer, and that he was designedly copying such statements as the following. 'When Paul says that we are justified freely through faith, he does not mean that contrition does not exist in those that are converted, or that the other virtues do not follow, yea rather he means that they are present; but he excludes the condition of merit or worthiness on our part; he denies that contrition or any virtues of ours are the causes of

our reconciliation, and he testifies that the cause thereof is the merit of Christ the Mediator. Nor is the meaning of our divines different when we say that we are justified by faith only. Nor does that word 'only' exclude contrition or other virtues from being present in him who is justified, but denies that they are the causes of our reconciliation, and transfers the cause to Christ alone. So that this saying, 'we are justified by faith in Christ,' is equivalent to this, that we are justified for the sake of Christ, and not for our own deservings. Faith is itself a work, like love, patience, chastity, and as these are infirm and weak, so is faith; so that we are not said to be justified by faith because faith is a virtue of such dignity as to deserve justification, but because there must needs be some instrument in us by which we lay hold upon the Mediator who intercedes on our behalf.' [*De Vocab. Gratiæ*].

But such a minute comparison of documents, as would be necessary in order fully to bring out all the evidence of this kind that might be adduced to show the extent of our Church's obligations to the Lutheran Reformers, and especially to Melanchthon, would be a task unsuitable to such lectures as ours. You should have the books in your hands, and full leisure to examine and compare the several passages, in order to prosecute such an inquiry with effect. But I suppose that what has been already said will be enough to show that, whilst much was copied, nothing was slavishly copied; and that the English divines regarded themselves not as the disciples, but as independent, though friendly and admiring colleagues, of their continental brethren.

The German Reformer to whom, next to Melanchthon, the English Reformation in its earlier stages was most indebted, was Martin Bucer, who has generally been ranked amongst the Lutherans, but who really, I think, stood by himself, and belonged to no peculiar school. And the same, by the way, may be remarked of Peter Martyr, another eminent foreigner, who, like Bucer, was domiciliated in England during Edward VI.'s reign, and who, like Bucer also, was frequently consulted by Cranmer. Bucer's known moderation, and wish to

conciliate the Roman Catholics, brought him into much discredit with Calvin and his immediate adherents. They said he was manufacturing a new kind of Popery in England; and some of them were pleased to augment the long catalogue of heresies with a new article, under the name of Bucerism.

But the truth is, that though in many respects a man of a congenial spirit to Cranmer's, Bucer seems to have been much more firm and resolute in pressing on progressive changes towards Protestantism than the Primate. It was at his instance, for example, that the practice of putting the elements into the mouths of the communicants was discontinued. It was on his earnest remonstrance that the prayers for the dead were expunged from the Liturgy. It was he who pointed out the danger of the clause in the prayer of consecration in which it was sought that the bread and wine might become the Body and Blood of Christ. And it was by his advice that the exorcism was omitted in the Baptismal Service, and the use of oil discontinued. It was he, too, who pressed the necessity of more frequent catechising, and more frequent communions, than were at first enjoined. 'He was,' says Burnet, 'a very learned, judicious, pious, and moderate person; perhaps he was inferior to none of all the Reformers for learning. But for zeal, for true piety, and a most tender care of preserving unity among the foreign Churches, Melanchthon and he, without any injury done the rest, may be ranked apart by themselves. He was much opposed by the Popish party at Cambridge, who, though they complied with the law, and so kept their places, yet, either in the way of argument, as it had been for dispute's sake, or in such points as were not determined, set themselves much to lessen his esteem. Nor was he furnished naturally with the quickness that is necessary for a dispute, from which they studied to draw advantages; and therefore Peter Martyr writ to him to avoid all public disputes with them. For they did not deal candidly on these occasions. They often kept up their questions till the hour of dispute, that so the extemporary faculty of him who was to preside might be the more exposed, and right or

wrong they used to make exclamations and run away with the triumph.'[2]

The reign of Edward VI. was a period of calm and steady, but not over-hasty progress for the Reformation. All through it the Protestant genius was in the ascendant in our Church. Whether a man admires or does not admire the tendency which was then in action, I think he cannot deny this. Nor can it, I think, be doubted, that the work which our leaders were pressing on in Edward VI.'s time came nearly to a standstill in Queen Elizabeth's, and that a serious reaction began with the Stuart dynasty.

The difference in the reign of Edward and in the reign of Charles I. did not consist in the outward appearance and face of things, but in the inward spirit which presided over the movement in both cases. There was certainly more of the appearance of Romanism in the external form of our Church and its offices under the primacy of Cranmer, than under the primacy of Laud. For Laud never advanced so far as to revive all the usages and rites which had prevailed in the first years of Edward VI. But the difference between the two cases was this,—that the movement under Cranmer's impulse was tending forward, the movement under Laud's influence was tending back. The Edwardian Reformers wished as far as possible to draw all classes of minds willingly under the influence of the National Church, in order that by that influence they might be gradually freed from the prejudices which might still hang round them; and for this purpose they accommodated the model of that Church to the temper of men's thoughts and dispositions. They did not, like the Swiss and Scottish Reformers, sternly at once require all to break through every old association in order to conform with them. They knew that such a course could not be followed without repelling at the outset all imperfectly Protestantised minds from their communion. And they saw that such Reformations as these had never been effected without violence and tumult; without in fact establishing at the com-

---

[2] Burnet, *Hist. Ref.* pt. ii. b. i. vol. ii. pp. 261-2, Ed. Nares.—EDITORS.

mencement something very like a reign of terror. They found a considerable majority of the population, a considerable majority of the clergy, tolerant more or less of substantially Protestant doctrine, though alarmed at the names of Lutheranism or Zwinglianism, and from habit, from reverence for antiquity, from taste, from a thousand influences and prejudices, attached to the old ancestral forms which religion had so long worn, that without them she would almost have appeared a stranger in their eyes. These they did not venture harshly to repel at once. They retained in the beginning as much as possible of the old forms, avoiding as much as possible any sudden visible break in the continuity of ecclesiastical arrangements, and preferring an incomplete but progressive, to a perfect but precipitate, reformation of externals. In consequence they were enabled to carry the people with them in their Reformation, and found their chief difficulty in the zeal of those ardent spirits who would have hurried on the change with a speed which might have endangered its success. But then, though the Reformation could not advantageously have moved too fast, the success of the Reformers' policy would have been equally endangered if it had failed to move at all. Their plan could only have been carried out by the mature but steady development of the spirit of Protestantism in the minds thus drawn within the circle of its influence.

The immediate effect of the course which they adopted, was to join, not blend—for they could not blend,—to join in temporary cohesion two alien elements. The old structures, and forms, and names, and usages were not really the detached and meaningless things which they appeared when placed in this new juxtaposition, like fragments of an ancient tessellated pavement studded here and there in the floor of a modern edifice; they had intimate relations to a closely connected system of which they had been parts; they were the natural growth of real and potent principles. They could not be safely left as they were; the presiding spirit must penetrate and master the whole frame, or the sources of disease and death will linger in the extremities, which it has not force to

animate. Upon some of these relics of a former system Protestantism might in time confer a new meaning and relation, assimilating them as it were to its own constitution and sending its own life-blood through them. But others it was needful to throw off as unhealthy processes, in proportion as it gathered strength and diffused its activity through the mass. To continue mere concessions to Romish prejudices a moment longer than was absolutely needful would have been a course of treatment as perilous to the Church's soundness as it would be injurious to a convalescent to keep him still in the atmosphere and on the diet of a sick-room.

The changes which the frame of the Church underwent in passing from the purity of the Apostolic to the complete and systematised corruption of the Papal state, were the symptoms of the working of an antichristian spirit, prevailing more and more in every age, till it acquired an universal predominance. They might not follow one another by strict rational inference, but their succession was nevertheless regulated by a law of development. Dry logical minds like those of the first Nonjurors might attach themselves to the mere matter of any of these forms of imperfect development, the institutions of the Cyprianic, or the Athanasian, or the Bernardine age, without being forced or even tempted further. But where there is not a mere one-sided contact—where the characteristics of imperfectly developed Romanism find an affinity not merely in the reason but in the tastes and sentiments—the imperfect system once adopted begins to perfect itself again in obedience to the law of its nature, like an exotic which, though starved and stunted in an uncongenial air, revives when transplanted into a greenhouse, and recovers the verdure of its foliage and the maturity of its fruit. Names and usages which have lost all emphasis or even significance to the Protestant ear and mind, still retain a deep and pregnant meaning for those whose tempers are congenial to the spirit from which they had emanated. They are seeds which want only a friendly soil to germinate and grow anew. As

one note of a once familiar but long-forgotten air will sometimes bring back the whole sequence of the music,—as one drop of the poisonous liquor tasted will sometimes revive the feverish thirst of the reformed drunkard,—as one token of its joys or sorrows will in certain states of feeling restore the whole circle of our youthful remembrances and associations,—so to minds duly predisposed in their tendencies, the relics of the mediæval system possess a sort of magical potency to create afresh that system which formed the adequate complement of their ethical affinities. Let us take an instance from the way in which the mere study of ecclesiastical archæology has proved—most unexpectedly—a source of temptation to Romanism in many minds, at a time when the religious atmosphere was filled with the seeds of infection, though it is a study that at other times or by other minds might be prosecuted without any such peril. There is not a single part in the structure of our old cathedrals which had not a meaning. The architecture of the middle ages is the result of the principles of the middle ages—the form which architecture, in common with all the science and arts and manners of mankind, took from the singular plastic and pervading spirit of those ages. To a severe Protestant mind, that architecture is an unmeaning cypher or a mere piece of antiquarian pedantry, or if we choose to regard it in the best light possible, a monument of conquered error, the spoils of a vanquished foe hung up in the sanctuary, not for use but as the record of victory. But to other minds that architecture, like almost all other mediæval relics, is a powerfully suggestive moral principle. Let them catch but the sense of one word in the cypher, and they retrieve at once the whole meaning. It is to them no longer antiquarian lore, but knowledge full of practical directions. The spoils of idolatry are taken down to be used to the profanation of God's service.

I intend in the next lecture to open up some of the causes which prevented the full carrying out the design of the Edwardian Reformers. The chief of them, I think, was the alarm which our rulers felt at some of the tendencies of

extreme ultra-Protestantism, and the increasing influence of the Genevan Reformation. That a stoppage did take place is manifest, and let us not be ashamed to own it. Nobody who calmly considers the matter can, I think, maintain that our Church needs no more convenient standing legislature than the Houses of Parliament and the separate Provincial Convocations, which are the only machinery we have been left. Few persons will seriously say that our Liturgical Services might not be more conveniently arranged than they at present are; and fewer still will contend that our ecclesiastical courts and our ecclesiastical law are the very perfection of practical human wisdom; that our Dioceses are not a whit too large, and our Chapters thoroughly efficient. Believe me, it is a narrow insular prejudice which assumes that our excellent constitution in Church and State must necessarily be the most perfect thing of the kind conceivable. The existing structure of our ecclesiastical polity is, like some of our old English country seats, a patchwork of many designers, and in the various tastes of many times. There is the Roman pavement, the Saxon arch, the Norman tower, the Tudor mansion, and the modern house. Habit and veneration for the home of our fathers make us satisfied to put up with many inconveniences and incongruities in the old edifice. But let us not therefore be so foolish as to maintain, that the plan is the most regular and the arrangement the most commodious possible.

LECTURE VII.

INFLUENCE OF GENEVA ON THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Gentlemen,—We come now to consider the influence of the Genevan upon the English Reformation. And in order thoroughly to understand this, we must take a survey of the causes which gave to Calvin the commanding position that he occupied among the Protestant divines of the sixteenth century.

As soon as ever the Reformation had passed through its first stage, of a mere assault upon the corruptions of Romanism, and it became necessary to train an order of pastors who should not merely be controvertors, but instructors of the flock, the want of a Manual of Divinity began to be sensibly felt. The hope of the Protestant Churches, the teachers of the rising generation in a pure faith, could not be safely left to draw their own lessons in positive theology from the systems of Aquinas or Scotus, deeply tinctured as those systems were with all the errors from which the Reformation sought to set men free. Nay, the improved taste, as well as the improved knowledge, of the age imperatively demanded something more liberal in the style, as well as purer in the matter, than was to be found in those thorny old Scholastic treatises whose barbarisms and captious subtleties were becoming the laughing-stock of Europe.

To supply this want was the aim of Melanchthon's 'Loci Communes'—a work deeply impressed with the character of the author's mind; chaste, candid, and clear, with an anxious avoidance of exaggeration and an almost timid modesty, which

the proud and vehement who long to lead, and the weak who long to be led, will always mistake for feebleness, and in which none but the best order of minds will be able to recognise the features of true intellectual strength. Hence many were disappointed with Melanchthon's work, disappointed at that which was really one of its chief excellences, the absence of a complete system, and the avoidance, to a very great extent, of any blending of mere human science with the facts of revelation.

The field was thus left open to a more daring competitor, and such a competitor soon appeared in the person of John Calvin, whose 'Institutes of the Christian Religion' soon eclipsed by their brilliancy, and showy appearance of scientific completeness, the more humble and cautious labours of his predecessor. The publication of Calvin's 'Institutes' forms no unimportant epoch in the history of the Church. The rapidity and permanence of the effect produced by it upon public opinion has been scarcely ever equalled. Its author rose at once into the very foremost rank of great men, in an age prolific almost beyond parallel in genius; and his work becoming the acknowledged standard of faith with a large section of Protestants, was soon regarded with the profoundest reverence, as little less than inspired. Nay, so strongly is the impress of his ability stamped upon it, that even those who abominate his creed and cordially dislike his moral character, unite with his adherents in their loudest praises of the masculine vigour and penetrating sagacity which it displays. Neither the most bigoted Romanists nor the laxest Arminians have ever denied Calvin's claims to intellectual eminence. To the classical elegance and cultivated taste of Melanchthon, he added the unwearied energy and dauntless courage, the unwavering self-reliance, the unshaken nerve, the commanding spirit of Luther. And his eloquence held a sort of middle place between the styles of the two great German Reformers. It was neither so impetuous as Luther's, nor so equable and unimpassioned as Melanchthon's. But it had all the latter's purity with much of the former's glowing

fervour. In learning, indeed, he must yield to some of his contemporaries; but even in those tasks where learning might seem most requisite, as for example in his commentaries upon Scripture, his surprising acuteness and unfailing ingenuity have enabled him to surpass men of greater erudition but duller parts. He was apparently gifted with a marvellous power of seizing upon and applying at once just those parts of knowledge which suited his immediate purpose, without burdening his memory with anything immaterial; and so disproportionate did the extent of his theological attainments appear to the brief time and light study bestowed in gaining them that, says Hooker, 'divine knowledge he gathered not by hearing or reading, but by teaching others. For though thousands were debtors unto him touching knowledge in that kind, yet he to none, but only to God, the author of that most blessed fountain the Book of Life, and of that admirable dexterity of wit . . . . that were his guides.'[1]

One of the most striking powers in Calvin's powerful mind was one for which the French race, as a race, are remarkable, the power of lucid systematic arrangement. And it may be worth while, by the way, to notice the difference between the French and the German love of system. The French, I think, love system for the sake of the elegance of the effect. They love it as the Greeks loved it, for the beauty of harmonious order. And their systems are accordingly, like a Grecian edifice, neat, striking, and well-proportioned, and easily taken in at a glance. But the Germans love system, or construction, for its own sake, and therefore the more intricate and elaborately complex, like an old Gothic building, the system is, the greater scope in short it affords for what craniologists call the organ of constructiveness, the better are they pleased with such systems. Melanchthon was an exception to the genius of his nation, and it might seem at first sight that so are generally ourselves, the Anglo-Saxon offset of the great Teutonic family. For certainly the English appear to be the least systematic of philosophers, whether

---

[1] Preface to *Eccl. Polity*, ii. 1.

in theology, politics, or metaphysics. But this may be accounted for by observing that their constructiveness has rather taken the course of a mere material development in the founding of colonies, the erection of edifices, the devising of machinery, and the amassing of fortunes.

But to return: if Melanchthon's 'Commonplaces' were complained of as jejune, imperfect, and hesitating, certainly no such complaints could, with any shadow of plausibility, be made against Calvin's 'Institutes.' There was no gap in the compactness of his theological system. Every one of its parts was visibly related to the other, and the connection between them so close and intimate that scarce anything could be withdrawn or inserted without spoiling the symmetry of the whole.

I need not tell you that it is not in any such harmonious system the truths of revelation are delivered in revelation itself; or that, in order to give them such a semblance of systematic harmony, it is necessary to blend, to a very large extent, the conclusions of human science with the naked facts of revelation; or again, that such a blending must always be attended with many dangers.

All truths, indeed, we know beforehand must be homogeneous among themselves; but the ties and dependencies which unite the several parts of truth into an harmonious unity, are known perfectly only to Him whose omniscient intellect is the truth itself. And portions of it must, to finite beings, for ever remain but as broken fragments, whose connection with the whole it is impossible satisfactorily to trace.

This is specially the case with revealed truths. The very circumstance that they are revealed, i.e. made known to us by a supernatural authority, is a strong presumption that they do not touch so closely upon what we already know as to be discoverable from it; that they have their proper place in some part of the great system of truth which lies beyond the sphere of human observation; and consequently that in seeking to unite these fragments, thus presented to us without their mutual connections and dependencies, with that portion of

knowledge which we have already, by our natural powers, mastered and systematised, we shall mar instead of mending the harmony of the whole.

In truth Calvin, I am afraid, did a great deal to restore that unhappy union between metaphysics and theology, which the Schoolmen had blessed with the rites of the Church, but which the proper office of the Reformation was to terminate by a perpetual divorce. And I fear that much of the half-concealed infidelity of the later Church of Geneva, and of its sister Churches, was the natural issue of this ill-assorted match. Calvin, indeed, himself would have started with alarm and disgust, if he could have seen the portentous tenets which, in after ages, were put forward within the bounds of his own communion as the genuine developments of his theology, nor do I at all say that they are logical consequences from it. I mean only that when once the precedent has been set of importing speculations about the freedom of the will and the laws of the divine foreknowledge into the Institutes of the Christian faith, a dangerous, and an unnecessarily dangerous, precedent has been set, and an occasion afforded for the introduction of most portentous dogmas. I will not say that discussions about such subjects as 'fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,' should be wholly relegated to that region in which Milton has described them as interesting and perplexing the minds of beings more curious after knowledge than careful of duty, but I am sure that their proper place is not in the pulpit of the preacher or the chair of the catechist; and that they form no part either of the milk, or of the strong meat, which the Apostles have provided for the aliment of either babes or men in Christ.

Still, complete and well-proportioned systems in theology and in philosophy will always have great charms for the popular mind; and there can be no doubt, I think, that Calvin owed a very large share of the influence which he exercised to the complete and well-proportioned system of theology which his 'Institutes' placed at once in the hands of Protestant divines. It furnished them at once with something, and

something very plausible, to think and to say upon all the heads of their science, and precluded the necessity of repairing to the old and poisoned wells of doctrine which the Schoolmen had so largely provided for that purpose. But another quality which enabled Calvin, upon Luther's retirement from the scene, to take such a decided lead in the Protestant Churches, was that extraordinary capacity for business which he possessed in a remarkable degree, and in which Melanchthon was notoriously deficient. Calvin, like Luther, was formed for action, and, like him, he took the foremost place in every action he engaged in, with that natural supremacy of minds born for command, before which inferior spirits instinctively give way. He was a man collected within himself, driving forward his great objects with an undeviating consistency and an unremitting force. His energy was not the effect of transitory excitement, but the habitual tone of his mind. And his ambition, if the truth must be spoken, was as great as his abilities. Not content with an absolute dictatorship in his own city of Geneva, he aspired to a sort of primacy over all the Protestant Churches, and omitted nothing which could strengthen his influence in every quarter. Hooker, in the curious MS. which he drew up as the rough sketch of a reply to some of his Puritan opponents, has remarked upon the number of Calvin's dependents both abroad and at home, his intelligence from foreign Churches, his correspondence everywhere with the chiefest, his industry in pursuing them which did at any time openly either withstand his proceedings or gainsay his opinions; and he takes notice that Calvin's writing but of three lines in disgrace of any man was as forcible as any proscription throughout all Reformed Churches, while his rescripts and answers were considered by many as of equal authority with Decretal Epistles.[2] From this practical turn of mind, Calvin seems to have been led to form the grand design of furnishing the Reformation not only with a system

---

[2] MS. notes on the copy of the *Christian Letter* preserved in C.C. College, Oxford, and transcript of the same in Trinity College, Dublin. See in Keble's 3rd ed. of Hooker, Note to vol. i. p. 134.—EDITORS.

of doctrine, but with a system of ecclesiastical polity also. He saw the wonderful power which Romanism derived from its well-compacted spiritual hierarchy, independent of the civil magistrate. He saw the weakness which their humiliating dependence on the prince infused into the Churches of the Lutheran communion; and he aimed at giving the Protestant Churches such an organisation and such principles of government as should make them independent of the State and capable of independent action, without being forced to fall back upon the old plans of sacerdotalism, to which he rightly perceived that the genius of the reformed faith and worship was repugnant. Hence he was led to extract, as he thought, from the New Testament, that scheme of Presbyterianism which has found its full development nowhere perhaps so completely as in Scotland.

Now, in judging that the Church is originally independent of the State, Calvin, no doubt, judged aright. And if he had gone on to separate these two societies entirely in their aim and character, he might perhaps have guarded his scheme, as successfully as human infirmity will allow, against considerable danger either of predominating interference or very violent collision. But unfortunately the views which he entertained of the magistrate's office, when coupled with his views of Church authority, tended almost inevitably to make the magistrate almost as completely the slave of the Church in his system, as he is in the system of the Church of Rome. For the magistrate in Calvin's view is bound to repress heresy and false doctrine by the sword, or if he likes it better by the faggot, as in the case of Servetus; and he is bound to comfort, support, and strengthen the Church in every possible way by the exertion of his power and influence.

Now, if the magistrate be, as a magistrate, entrusted with the care of the souls of his people, and yet he is only a member, without any greater power in it than any other lay-member, of the Church which is also entrusted with that care, it is plain that the magistrate must be content either to stand in the awkward position of a disobedient and schismatical

member of the Church, or become the mere executioner of its decrees.

This tendency of Calvin's scheme of discipline to lower the position of the civil magistrate, was probably one great reason why his plan of Church government was regarded with jealousy and aversion by the heads both of Church and State in England during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, though, during that same period, some of them were warm admirers of his theological system. Indeed, even his theology met with no great favour from Cranmer or Ridley, or Latimer or Hooper, and there are extant letters from Melanchthon, pressing the English prelates to provide a check to the Stoical disputations, as he calls them, to which the new Zeno was addicted.[3] But other men of much weight in our Church had even then embraced it, and in Elizabeth's reign it is curious to remark that Archbishop Whitgift was, as the Lambeth Articles show, almost equally zealous, at once for enforcing the Calvinistic theology and resisting the Calvinistic discipline.

Our divines did, indeed, in general agree with Calvin in holding that spiritual things and the cure of souls fell within the magistrate's province, but then they commonly assigned him a right of veto upon the Church's acts, of control over her ministers in their highest functions, and of exemption from judicial ecclesiastical censures. And while the sovereign was well disposed to patronise such views of his prerogative, he was naturally strongly opposed to such as would rob him of half his dignity. He would have deemed it a thing hardly worth his trouble to free himself from the spiritual power of the Pope, only to place himself under the spiritual power of his own subjects, and those not high and dignified prelates, but the poorest of the clergy and perhaps the lowest of the laity, who from the republican character of Presbyterianism, might at any time play an influential part in the religious assemblies. James I. expressed, in his homely way, pretty much the feeling of all the Tudor and Stuart princes on this subject,

---

[3] See in Laurence, *Bampton Lecture*, pp. 230–1, cf. pp. 410–11 and 421.

when he told the Puritans at Hampton Court, 'If you aim at a Scottish Presbytery, it agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick shall meet and censure me and my Council. Stay, I pray you, for one seven years before you demand it, and then if you find me grow pursy and fat, I may, perchance, hearken unto you; for that government will keep me in breath, and give me work enough.'[4]

Probably, on the other hand, it was a sense of the power which such a plan of Church government threw into the hands of the religious leaders of the people which, unknown to themselves, fanned in the minds of some of his immediate disciples their zeal for that scheme into so fierce a flame. Certain it is that from being at first considered only the best and purest, it soon began to be regarded as the only lawful form of Church government, and as claiming establishment on the ground of an unalterable and indefeasible Divine Right, which kings and people were required to submit to at their peril. This resemblance between the Romanists and ultra-Protestants, and the contrast between them and the Church of England, has been strongly brought out by an authority whom good churchmen in these countries used, when I was young, to hold in special reverence—I mean Bishop Sanderson. 'The Papist,' says he, in his eloquent defence of English Episcopacy, 'groundeth the Pope's œcumenical supremacy upon Christ's command to Peter to execute it, and to all the flock of Christ (princes also as well as all others) to submit to him as to their universal Pastor. The Presbyterian crieth up his model of government and discipline (although minted in the last bygone century) as the very sceptre of Christ's kingdom, whereunto all kings are bound to submit theirs, making it as unalterable and inevitably necessary to the being of a Church as the Word and Sacraments are. The Independent Separatist also, upon that grand principle of Puritanism, common to him with the Presbyterian (the very root of almost all the sects in the

---

[4] Collier's *Eccl. Hist. of Great Britain*, ii. p. 681.

world) viz., that nothing is to be ordered in Church matters, other or otherwise than Christ hath appointed in His Word, holdeth that any company of people gathered together by mutual consent in a Church way, is *jure divino* free and absolute within itself to govern itself by such rules as it shall judge agreeable to God's Word, without dependence upon any but Christ Jesus alone, or subjection to any prince, prelate, or human person or consistory whatsoever. All these (you see) do not only claim a *jus divinum*, and that of a very high nature, but in setting down their opinions, seem in some expresses tending to the diminution of the ecclesiastical supremacy of princes. Whereas the Episcopal party neither meddle with the power of princes, nor are ordinarily very forward to press the *jus divinum*, but rather purposely decline the mentioning of it, as a term subject to misconstruction, or else so interpret it as not of necessity to import any more than an Apostolical institution.' (p. 40.)

But to return: upon the errand of establishing the Calvinistic discipline, Knox (whose character was a sort of coarse likeness of his master's) came to head the turbulent Reformers of the Scottish Church; and Cartwright (a man far inferior to Knox in the talents of a demagogue, and having to work under much less favourable circumstances) undertook, with Travers as his coadjutor, a similar experiment in England. The old childish contest about particular ceremonies and vestments, though still kept up as furnishing popular topics of declamation, became now a matter of secondary importance. The great object was the introduction of 'The Discipline;' and the war was soon regularly opened by the two famous 'Admonitions' to Parliament, setting forth its duty touching a reform in matters ecclesiastical. Their first success was surprising. It seemed for a while likely that the citadel might be carried by assault. 'It may be remembered,' says George Cranmer in his letter to Hooker, 'that at first the greatest part of the learned in the land were either eagerly affected, or favourably inclined that way. The books then written for the most

part then savoured of the disciplinary style; it sounded everywhere in pulpits, and in the common phrase of men's speech: the contrary part began to fear they had taken a wrong course: many which impugned the discipline, yet so impugned it, not as not being the better form of government, but as not so convenient for our state in regard of dangerous innovations likely to grow. One man alone there was, to speak of (whom let no suspicion of flattery deprive of his deserved commendation), who, in the diffidence of the one part, and courage of the other, stood in the gap, and gave others respite to prepare themselves for the defence; which by the sudden eagerness and violence of their adversaries had otherwise been prevented.'[5]

The person to whom Cranmer here refers was Dr. (afterwards Archbishop) Whitgift, who, in a short answer to the Admonitions, exposed the sophistry of their arguments and the danger of their principles with great vigour and cogency of reason. This called forth a reply from Cartwright, and that again an elaborate defence from Whitgift.

The combatants were not ill-matched. Cartwright possessed, at any rate, that intense activity of mind which seems almost to compensate for the want of genius in men of moderate parts. Every page of his writings betrays evident tokens of inordinate pride and self-conceit; the natural consequence of which was a stiff obstinacy in all his opinions, and a preconceived contempt for everything that could be alleged against them. To a great command of words, a flowing style, a considerable skill in the lower kinds of rhetoric, he united that inexhaustible capacity of mistaking or begging the real question, and that fertility in irrelevant declamation, which enable a controvertist to dispute for ever on the wrong side. His reading was great and multifarious, but undigested. He was one of those men whom Bentley described as having large appetites and weak digestions: and his 'Greek and Latin sentences, unchewed, came up again for the most part unchanged.'

---

[5] In Keble's *Hooker*, vol. ii. p. 598.

Except only in the indefatigable activity for which they were both remarkable, Whitgift was the very opposite of his antagonist. His learning was solid, but not extensive; yet such was his dexterity and promptness of application, that it stood him in better stead than Cartwright's unwieldy erudition. His style is homely, quite devoid of that periodic structure and those oratorical embellishments which Cartwright affected, and closely resembling the strong, clear, and nervous English of our early Reformers. An acute and expert logician, he possessed, moreover, that 'large sound roundabout sense' which (according to Locke) is the great distinction between a man of sense and mere verbal chicaners. Yet it must not be denied that, from want of a philosophical knowledge of human nature, he is apt to estimate an argument according to its logical value alone, and to think that he has done enough when he has shown its worthlessness in this respect, without going to the bottom of those complicated prejudices, mistakes, and confusions, which gave it plausibility in the popular mind. His greatest fault, however, was his choleric disposition. He loses all temper at Cartwright's perpetual *petitiones principii*, breaks out into uncontrollable impatience at his hollow periods and wordy harangues; and often cannot even restrain himself from bursting into personal invectives against his old opponent. To this indeed—I mean the personal reflections—both the combatants are too prone. But Cartwright's is the bitter disdain and deep-seated hostility of a stern and arrogant mind; while Whitgift evinces rather, like Gratiano, the passionate and sudden violence of a warm and hasty temper.

Soon after the publication of his Defence, Whitgift was raised to the Bench; and seeing Cartwright still pertinaciously keeping up the contest, in a happy hour for the Church of England, he selected Richard Hooker to take his place in the controversy. To say that Hooker was learned, if by learning we mean mere extent or variety of reading, is but small praise. In this sense Cartwright was at least his equal, perhaps his superior in erudition. But Hooker was not one

of those pedantic scholars who 'seem to have been at a banquet of languages and stolen away the scraps.' He had fed his mind upon the wholesome nutriment of learning. The wisdom, the eloquence, the imagery of ancient sages, orators, and poets, had become assimilated (as it were) with the substance of his own thoughts, and wrought into the very bone and muscle of his native genius. Profound without obscurity; imaginative yet not fanciful; a mighty master of the passions, but ever loving first to convince the reason, he enlightened the understanding while he touched the heart. With a soul that rose superior to all the petty quarrels of faction, he seemed designed as the proper guardian of truth and moderation in an age of narrow bigotry and cross-grained fanaticism. Such a man, combining in rare union the Schoolman's speculative acuteness which the Statesman's practical wisdom—yet meek and charitable though a polemic, and deeply pious though a politician—such a man as this deserves the proud title of the glory of the English priesthood. Long may the Church which he defended revere his memory, and profit by his labours, and her sons to the remotest posterity, imbibing the generous principles which he advocated, preserve unimpaired that goodly structure of Ecclesiastical polity, which consecrated by the memory of holy men and martyrs of our religion, has proved so long the inviolable shrine of the purest faith in Christendom!

LECTURE VIII.

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY FROM HENRY VIII. TO THE RESTORATION.

Gentlemen,—The transcendent authority of the sovereign in England may be said to have been at its meridian from Henry VIII. to Queen Elizabeth. Under James I. (notwithstanding all his boasted kingcraft) it began visibly to decline; and the attempt of his unhappy successor to carry it even higher than it ever rose before, served only to precipitate its extinction. Henry VII., through the whole course of his long and peaceful reign, had employed all the arts of a crafty and unscrupulous policy to break the power of his nobles; and a favourable conjuncture of events had rendered his project eminently successful. The necessary consequence of this was, to throw additional weight into the scale of the Commons; who, now beginning to take some repose from the constant feuds in which they had been engaged by the oppressive Barons, were well disposed to prefer the settled and quiet sway of a single superior to the eternal dissensions of a multitude of ambitious chiefs. Furthermore, the king was at once avaricious and fond of power. He not only loved riches for their own sake, but he felt also that the treasures he had amassed had given him advantages which few of his most fortunate predecessors had enjoyed. Both these motives made him an encourager of commerce and manufactures. And thus the first effect of the improvement of the Commons was the exaltation of the royal prerogative by means of that very body who were ultimately to prove the strongest and most lasting check upon its operations. For now, when the continued enjoy-

ment of prosperity and independence had raised their spirit; when the gradual diffusion of information had increased their intelligence, and brought them to know their rights as well as their duties; when the royal tyranny came to be considered as it was in itself, and not merely in comparison with the more harassing domination of a set of inferior lords, the Commons began to entertain the will, and to find that they had the power, to set bounds to exorbitancies of this enormous and undefined authority.

The support, then, of the Commons, upon which Henry VII. hoped to build, as one of the props of his edifice of despotism, was destined to prove an insecure foundation. However, it served his purpose for a time. The dominion of the Barons was now fairly broken, and the prince might have enjoyed the full plenitude of absolute sway, but for one chain which still hung heavily upon the royal sceptre. This was the power of the Pope. But from this, too, the headstrong spirit of his son soon set it free, and the transference of the ecclesiastical supremacy to the Crown, converted the Church, which had before been his most dangerous rival, into the most efficient and supple engine of prerogative. But in effecting this great revolution, Henry VIII. had been compelled to call up a spirit which he sought in vain to conjure down when its task had been performed. Public opinion, once brought to bear, was found to possess a force which it was impossible to resist; and many of those, with whom the necessity of the times compelled Cranmer and Somerset to work upon public opinion, held tenets as little favourable to regal as to papal supremacy.

These men belonged to the party which afterwards became so celebrated under the title of Puritans. Their opinions were partly composed out of the prejudices of the old gospellers, driven by persecution into a fanatical opposition to the established state of things, and partly derived from an extravagant admiration for the discipline as well as the doctrines of Calvin, contracted by many during their exile, and heightened by the influence of the foreign Reformers. Many

of them too, no doubt, were men of an ambitious and domineering spirit, who thought no Reformation could be effectual that was not violent, and were thirsting to play a like important part in England as their brother preachers had played in Scotland and Geneva. Their object was not toleration, but the establishment of the discipline (as they called it) upon the ruins of the former Establishment and the ancient hierarchy. But here we must be careful to distinguish between the noisy leaders and the great bulk of the Puritans; for it would be unjust to attribute to the whole body all the definitely factious principles which the leaders avowed. They were for the most part men of captious and over-scrupulous minds, whom perhaps a little more indulgence in their whims and singularities might have kept in good humour, till the peaceful influence of common sense and enlightened liberality had put their extravagances out of countenance, but whom the ill-timed severity of the Court ultimately exasperated into sedition.

Henry VIII.'s real quarrel was not with the doctrines but the power of the Pope, and his daughter Elizabeth was well disposed to favour the Roman Catholics if they would make a full acknowledgment of her independent authority. Hence she was anxious to effect a compromise between them and the Church of England, thinking that if she could only make the Church her own instrument, the more it was surrounded with circumstances of splendour and recommended to the people by old associations and long prescription, the better fitted it would be to support her absolute power. But there were many bye ends, and even weaknesses, which prevented her from acting steadily on this principle. The avarice of herself and her favourites gave occasion to that disgraceful system of sacrilege and extortion by which the Church was so shamefully dilapidated as to be unable, in some parts of the country, to retain even its just influence or command even a decent share of respect; while her nervous dread of becoming herself enslaved by the very power which she sought to work by, induced her sometimes to play the Puritans against the

Bishops, and oppose faction to faction in the Church as well as in the State. However, the general bent of her policy was obvious enough. Hence the patriots, by a natural revulsion, began gradually to adopt the most ultra-reforming opinions, and to consolidate that fatal alliance with the Puritan leaders which ended in the ruin of the constitution. Not that we are to suppose that the country party adopted the Puritan theory of Church polity; on the contrary they were, I think, at least as Erastian as the Queen herself. But they thought they saw in the splendour of the Prelacy the marks of a power inimical to their liberties; they wished to have the supremacy conferred upon the Parliament instead of the Prince; and though it would be unfair to say that they were, until a late period, Presbyterians, yet they certainly from the first desired to introduce a more moderate and economical hierarchy than they found established. The Church had been the great bulwark of prerogative; and it was therefore, by its very nature, one of the points upon which the Commons formed their earliest attacks. With this party were mixed up a set of irreligious politicians, few, but considerable in station and talents, who were totally indifferent to all forms of Church government in themselves, but who were anxious to overturn both Church and State, in order that they might enjoy the plunder of the one, and get the management of the other into their own hands.

These men, of course, made no scruple of working with any agents who had extensive influence with the populace; and this qualification the Puritan clergy possessed in no small degree. The more discreditable arts by which this influence was acquired and maintained have been described by Hooker, in the Preface, with that lively graphic distinctness which characterises all his historical sketches; and by Hobbes in his 'Behemoth' with that sarcastic bitterness and one-sided force, which are equally characteristic of the satires which he was pleased to call his histories. But to these must be added, their skill and diligence in preaching and in private conference; their plausible though shallow logic; their warm and

stirring eloquence; but above all the austere sanctity of their manners, and the fervour of zealous devotion by which they appeared to be actuated.

It is lamentable to think how little was done by the Court in any reasonable way to counterwork a set of men who enjoyed such remarkable advantages. The Queen strangely overrated the efficiency of coercion, and underrated the force of opinion. Instead of taking care to rear and provide for a learned and competent preaching ministry, who might beat the Puritans at their own weapons, she would prohibit preaching altogether; deprive the Nonconformists, and yet not supply their places with any better. Instead of reforming the abuses of prophesyings, she suppressed them. Instead of distinguishing between well-grounded and unreasonable complaints, she would admit of no questioning whatever of anything once enjoined. However, towards the latter end of her reign, through the prudent management of Archbishop Whitgift, some of these defects began to be remedied; and such was the effect which began to be produced by the writings of that great prelate in defence of the Church, and those of Saravia, Sutcliffe, Cooper, Bridges, and Hooker, that the Puritan apologists (who generally belonged to the worst section of the party) were driven from the field and reduced to an ignominious silence. How much their spirit had been broken appeared plainly from the altered tone of their leaders when they addressed James I. upon his accession to the throne; and I think it probable that if that prince had been really disposed to maintain the English constitution, and to amend what was in truth objectionable in the Church, he might have closed this gaping wound, and healed those dissensions which then threatened, and finally produced a fatal termination.

But James entertained plans inconsistent with such a course of proceeding. He had devised an elaborate scheme of despotism, and the maintenance of all its instruments was essential to its execution. He was a man of great ambition and small courage, of extraordinary sagacity, but of still more egregious vanity and weakness, so that he was often bullied

or coaxed by his favourites (and what ignominious favourites were they!) into measures which he plainly perceived to be unjust or even ruinous. When he had provoked resistance, he wanted firmness to crush it, and too often preferred a disgraceful retreat to a hazardous encounter. He had little regard to his own or the nation's honour; and by his undignified conduct, so different from that of the Tudor princes, taught the people to regard the Crown with less of awful respect than they had hitherto been accustomed to feel towards it. His reign was peaceful indeed, but pregnant with the seeds of dissension; while, to use the quaint words of N. Bacon, 'he spake peace abroad and sang lullaby at home; yet like a dead calm in a hot spring, treasured up sad distempers against a back-winter.'

James's outrageous ill-treatment of his last Parliament but one had roused a general spirit of opposition to arbitrary power, which his mean concessions to the last had rather encouraged than appeased. His marriage treaties, first with Spain and then with France (the two natural enemies, as they were then regarded, of England) had excited a no less general dread of Popery, amounting almost to a panic. His patronage of Arminianism towards the latter part of his reign (unluckily contemporaneous with his increased indulgence to the Romish recusants) created an inseparable connection in the popular mind between those three great terrors of the times, Popery, Arminianism, and Arbitrary Power. Doctrinal Calvinism had spread widely in England under the patronage of Whitgift and Abbot, and of James himself in the first years of his reign. Its maintainers, among whom were the principal patriots, considered it as exclusively the doctrine of the Church of England, and looked upon Arminians as little better than Papists in disguise. Indeed, in most of the points wherein they differed from Calvinists, the Arminians did approach more nearly to what was the prevailing opinion among Romanists,—as in free will, justification, and the possibility of falling from grace. The prejudice thus created against them as innovators, and what was worse, Popish

innovators, was still further inflamed by some peculiarities of the Arminian divines of the time, in no way necessarily connected with their distinctive religious creed. Such were a taste for splendour and ceremony in public worship, and the inculcation of the principles of passive obedience and the divine right of kings. It was not unnatural, therefore, that the Parliament, when they began to intermeddle in Church matters against the Crown (a claim of theirs which Queen Elizabeth had ever obstinately opposed) should commence by endeavouring to check what they looked upon as heretical innovations of Arminians against the current doctrine of the Church. Charles I. no doubt acted wisely as well as justly in opposing them here. But, like all his wise and just acts, it was done ungraciously, and accompanied with circumstances of extreme folly and impropriety. At the same time that he protected Montague, he pardoned, and rewarded with a bishopric, Mainwaring also, who had been deservedly impeached for preaching the absolute power of the sovereign. Was it not natural for the jealousies of a free Protestant people to be excited, when they saw such measures taken by a king many of whose ministers were avowed Romanists; who had an establishment of Romanist priests in his own palace, himself under the influence of a bigoted and unfeeling Romanist princess; who had agreed that his children, till the age of thirteen, should be reared by Romanists; who entertained a Papal envoy in his capital; and who compounded with his Romish subjects, for a sum of money, for all their transgressions of the penal laws, past, present, and to come? But it was in Archbishop Laud, the king's prime favourite and adviser, that the Puritans thought they saw the very personification of the mystery of iniquity, which was to issue in the establishment of Popery upon the ruins of gospel truth and civil freedom. In the present age, we can perceive that the charge of a deliberate Popish plot urged against him was wholly untrue, and arose partly from malicious slander and partly from prejudice and misconception. But we must make allowance for the temper of men at that time, and the real causes which

they had for serious apprehension. Laud was, indeed, sincere in his attachment to the Church and King. But his Church was a persecuting hierarchy, and his King an arbitrary monarch. Laud perceived with concern the growing distaste which prevailed towards the externals of religion, and grieved to see how little the public worship of the Church resembled the model which he found in the works of the Fathers. It may be granted that he was naturally fond of forms and outward pomp; but it is fair to add also, that he was actuated by a better motive in risking so much for their sake, at a time the most unpropitious that can be imagined for such an attempt. He considered, no doubt, that as the mass of mankind are more affected by sensible than by spiritual things, it is of service to make, as far as may be, sensible things the means whereby they may be reminded of religion, and drawn up, as it were, to matters of a purer and more abstract nature; and finding that the prejudices of the Puritans led them to set but too little value upon prayers as compared with preaching, he wished to oppose to the charms of their rhetoric some more powerful attraction in the liturgical offices of the Church.

But however honest his design, his mode of carrying it out showed a sad lack of good taste and knowledge of human nature. To define speculatively the point at which ceremonies cease to be useful and become superstitious, would be impossible. It can only be said, in general, that whenever a rite becomes burdensome, or a gesture violent and indecorous, so as to detain the mind from passing from the sign to the thing signified, and tempt the performer to rest in the outward act, the means no longer serve the end, and the ceremony degenerates into mummery. In practice we can, for the most part, see clearly enough where this boundary is overstepped; and hardly anyone (who is not strongly prejudiced) will deny that Laud's ceremonies—for example, in celebrating the Eucharist at the dedication of St. Catherine Cree—were flagrant instances of, to say the least, a theatrical and vulgar taste. 'When he came near the altar,

he bowed seven times; and coming to the bread, he gently lifted up the napkin, which he laid down again and withdrew, and bowed several times; then he uncovered the bread, and bowed as before; the like he did with the cover of the cup; then he received the Sacrament, and gave it to some principal men.'[1] But Laud's method of establishing ceremonies evinced no more wisdom or moderation than his innovations themselves showed good taste. Indeed, the whole plan of forcing ceremonies upon an unwilling people, was about as absurd in theory as it was ruinous in practice. For, whether we consider ceremonies as sensible attractions by which the imagination is won to devotion, or as the natural outward expressions of internal feeling, or as mementoes to keep the attention awake, and make us recollect the solemnity of the service we are engaged in—in whatever light we regard them (except, indeed, as mere *opera operata*), it is evident that they require the good-will and inclination of the performers to go with them, and that pains and penalties are not the way to secure such favourable dispositions. But the truth is that Laud (through the common infirmity of narrow minds), when he had once satisfied himself that a measure was good in itself, forthwith determined to carry it out—to do it 'thorough,' according to his favourite maxim—without ever considering whether it was worth the danger, scandal, and disgust which it must infallibly create in others. He never reflected that other men doated as childishly upon their fancies as he did on his.

But further, it is quite impossible to acquit Laud of a full participation, at least, in the despotic measures which the king had recourse to after the memorable proclamation in which he enjoined his subjects to 'speak no more of Parliaments,' i.e., to speak no more of an integral part of the English constitution. Every extraordinary stretch of the prerogative which former monarchs had occasionally ventured

---

[1] 2 Rushw. *Hist. Coll.* 77, apud Burn's *Eccl. Law*, s. v. 'Church.' The acts above described seem to have been at the reception of the Sacrament after its consecration.—EDITORS.

on, was now construed into a regular precedent; and these precedents were digested into a system of absolutism which courtly churchmen bound on the people's conscience, and venal judges published as the law. It has been said in excuse for Laud, that a Bishop was not to be expected to understand legal niceties. But it required no knowledge of legal niceties to understand that ship-money (as it was levied in that reign) could only be enforced on principles which left no man any longer anything that he could call his own; and if Laud were indeed so ignorant, he should not have meddled in matters which he did not understand.

But after all, perhaps, it was Laud's personal faults, even more than his oppressive administration, which raised against him that unexampled and implacable opposition which finally crushed him to the ground. His manner (Lord Clarendon[2]) was harsh, violent, and overbearing. Though he really had strong religious feelings, he showed but little of them in his outward deportment, and he took delight in hurting the prejudices of others. Those enemies whom he could easily trample upon he treated with the most studied and galling insults, which, however, did not prevent him from inflicting severer punishment. His vindictive spirit would stoop to any quarry, and he had the meanness to drag even poor Archie Armstrong, the king's jester, before the Star Chamber, for asking, 'Who is the fool now?' when the news came of the Scottish insurrection. His persecution of Williams is a still fouler blot upon his memory. Yet, like Wolsey, he was gentle to his inferiors, a munificent patron of letters, of boundless generosity to the poor, and the strictest loyalty to his prince. The independence and advancement of the hierarchy was the darling object of his life, which he prosecuted with an openness and vigour that disgusted all other classes of the community. The Treasurer's staff was given to Juxon,

---

[2] 'He was a man of very morose manners, and a very sour aspect, which in that time was called gravity.' 'He had usually about him an uncourtly quickness, if not sharpness, and did not sufficiently value what men said or thought of him.'—Clarendon, *Hist. Reb.*, vol. i., pt. i., pp. 89, 150. Oxf. 1705.—EDITORS.

Bishop of London, and Laud's favourite colleague, Wren of Ely, was heard to declare that he hoped to see the day when the poorest priest in England would hold his head as high as any Jack gentleman among them all.

It is hard to say how Laud could reconcile his views on this subject with his treatment of the Scottish Church, on which he forced a liturgy and canons, without even asking the consent of the General Assembly. Certain it is that for this piece of wanton tyranny the Court paid dearly. An insurrection ensued, and the presence of a Scottish army in England forced the king once more to seek the aid of his insulted Parliament. They met; and such was their unexpected good humour, that if the king had been disposed to govern fairly, all might yet have been well. But Charles, blinded by a fatal infatuation, hastily dissolved them; and with equal madness continued the more servile Convocation. The Convocation not only granted his Majesty extraordinary subsidies to repair his finances, but drew up a body of canons, some of which seemed pointed against the liberty of the subject; and imposed the famous *Et cetera* oath, which startled even many of the most devoted champions of Church and King.[3] These impolitic measures gave the last blow to Episcopacy in England. And when the fatal Long Parliament at last assembled, the storm which was to sweep away the framework of the constitution fell first on this ill-omened Synod. From the men, they soon passed by an easy transition to the office. In this, however, it must be owned that the leaders of the constitutional party moved unwillingly, and would not have moved at all, but for the pressure from without of that furious faction which they had hoped to make their servants, but which became, in fact, their masters. For the patriots, in their struggle for freedom, were obliged to form themselves into a party; and as the House of

---

[3] Canons of 1640. The oath is in Canon VI.: 'Nor will I ever give my consent to alter the Government of this Church, by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, &c., as it stands now established.' See Sparrow's *Collection*, pp. 335 seqq.—EDITORS.

Commons now in its turn became the aggressors on the constitution, and the king (though with a very bad grace) its champion, the Commons felt that their extraordinary power and influence must cease the moment the nation was satisfied that all their just grievances were redressed. They felt that they had personally forfeited the favour, and deeply wounded the pride of the king, and that their retirement from the conspicuous place which they had filled would be not only undignified but unsafe. Hence they sought to prolong their sway by making grievances when they could no longer find them, and keeping the populace in a state of chronic excitement. Hence the demand of those two unconstitutional securities, the Bill for depriving the king of the power of dissolving Parliament, and for vesting in the legislature the command of the militia—the last of which Charles vainly opposed, after foolishly consenting to the former. Hence they at last were brought to purchase the Scottish alliance by the establishment of the Presbyterian discipline. And having now lost all their popularity by such base trickery, and above all by the murder of a prince who never appeared so truly great and good as in the closing scene, they found too late that they were but tools in the hands of those whom they most despised, and had to succumb to that swarm of armed enthusiasts, who outwitted the Patriots, outprayed the Puritans, and outfought the Cavaliers, and with the most rapid progress overturned and desolated all before them in their extreme haste to establish an Independent Millennium. But the new party were united only in their zeal for destruction. Otherwise they were a mere Babel of discordant sects. They were held together for a brief space by the superior genius of Cromwell, but on his death soon gave way before the spring-tide of popular opinion, which now returned impetuously over its wonted channels, bearing the Crown and the Mitre once more united in triumph on its exulting waves.

LECTURE IX.

REACTION UNDER CHARLES I. AND LAUD—LAUDIAN THEOLOGY.

Gentlemen,—In the brief sketch which I gave in my last lecture of the state of things in the English Church from the reign of Elizabeth to the breaking out of the Great Rebellion, I had not time to dwell very minutely upon the details of the great attempt made by Laud and his coadjutors to alter the previously prevailing system of Anglican theology. I said enough, however, to show that it involved, in its general character, an approximation (whether justifiable or not is a question not for me to determine, I am here a Professor not of Theology but of History), an approximation to the system of the unreformed Churches, and therefore must be considered as [aiming at a counter-Reformation.[1]

The alarm in the minds of Protestants at this time, which has been already mentioned, was accompanied by a corresponding encouragement among the Romanist party. In the indications of a Romeward tendency, they saw enough to embolden them to express hopes of a speedy return to

---

[1] A portion of the MS. of this Lecture has been lost. We have supplied these words because in the sequel we find the term 'counter-reformers.' The remainder of what is enclosed in brackets is neces-ary to introduce the earlier part of the extract from the work of the Jesuit Knott, of which a considerable portion remains in the MS. of the Lecture. Knott's real name was Matthias Wilson, but he sometimes called himself Nicholas Smith, and was elected Provincial of the Jesuits in 1643. When Chillingworth was printing his answer to Knott's book Laud heard that Knott was getting the sheets from the printer in Oxford, and wrote a very severe and characteristic letter to the Vice-Chancellor in consequence. See *New Gen. & Biog. Dict.* 1761–7, s. v. Knott.—Editors.

Romanism in England under the auspices of the Court. In Heylin's 'Life of Laud,' iv. p. 5, Dublin, 1705, *ad an.* 1633, speaking of the Church at that time, he says: 'If you will take her character from the pen of a Jesuit, you shall find him speaking, amongst many falsehoods, these undoubted truths; viz., 'that the professors of it, they especially of greatest worth, learning, and authority, love temper and moderation; that the doctrines are altered in many things; as for example the Pope not Antichrist, pictures, freewill, predestination, universal grace, inherent righteousness, the preferring of charity before knowledge, the merit (or reward rather) of good works; the Thirty-nine Articles seeming patient, if not ambitious also, of some Catholic sense; that their churches begin to look with a new face, their walls to speak a new language, and some of their divines to teach, "that the Church hath authority in determining controversies of faith and interpreting the Scriptures; that men in talk and writing use willingly the once fearful names of priests and altars, and are now put in mind that for exposition of Scripture they are by canon bound to follow the Fathers." So far the Jesuit may be thought to speak nothing but the truth.' He then enumerates some of the remaining particulars mentioned by the Jesuit, which he says that 'the Jesuit cannot prove to have been positively maintained by any one divine in the Church of England.' The word 'positively,' here used, is very significant, and it will presently be seen that he has mitigated the force of the Jesuit's assertion in one particular, by inserting after 'merit' the parenthesis '(or reward rather),' as if this insertion was due to the Jesuit. This Jesuit was the man who, under the name of Edward Knott, wrote a work called 'Charity Mistaken,' which was answered by Dr. Potter, Provost of Queen's College, Oxford. In reply to this he again wrote another book, entitled 'Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholiques;' and it was in answer to this that Chillingworth wrote his great work, 'The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation.' In the 'Preface to the Author of Charity Maintained,' prefixed to this work, Chillingworth

gives, in § 20, what we may fairly believe to be the exact words of Knott, which he pronounces to be 'a scurrilous libel, void of all truth, discretion, and honesty.' Chillingworth thus addresses the Jesuit: 'The other part of your accusation strikes deeper and is more considerable; and that tells us that 'Protestantism waxeth weary of itself; that the professors of it, they especially of greater worth, learning, and authority, love temper and moderation; and are at this time more unresolved where to fasten than at the infancy of their Church; that their churches begin to look with a new face; their walls to speak with a new language; their doctrine to be altered in many things for which their progenitors forsook the then visible Church of Christ; for example, the Pope not Antichrist; prayer for the dead; Limbus Patrum; pictures; that the Church hath authority][2] in determining controversies of faith, and to interpret Scripture; about free will, predestination, universal grace; that all our works are not sins; merit of good works; inherent justice; faith alone doth not justify; traditions; Commandments possible to be kept; that their Thirty-nine Articles are patient, nay ambitious of some sense wherein they may seem Catholic; that to allege the necessity of wife and children in these days is but a weak plea for a married minister to compass a benefice; that Calvinism is at length accounted heresy or little less than treason, that men in talk and writing use willingly the once fearful names of priests and altars; and that they are now put in mind that for exposition of Scripture they are by canon bound to follow the Fathers.' And so strong, we know, was the persuasion at Rome of the unprotestantising intentions of the great leader of this movement, that his panegyrical biographer, Peter Heylin himself, informs us a Romish agent offered Laud a Cardinal's hat; and this offer, it is remarkable that Laud, then Bishop of St. David's, and expecting every day to

---

[2] The remainder of this extract exists in the original MS. What the Bishop mentions presently after follows also immediately in Heylin. See further the Account of Chillingworth's Life and Writings prefixed to his Works, Wood's *Athenæ*, and Laud's *Remains*.—EDITORS.

be made Primate of all England, for Abbot had just died, treated neither as a jest nor as insult, but merely replied that 'somewhat dwelt within him which would not suffer him to accept the offer till Rome were otherwise than it was.' It is not surprising that the emissary should have regarded so gentle a rebuff as little more than maiden coyness; and accordingly we are told that, within a fortnight after, the king having been in the meanwhile made aware of the whole transaction, the same offer was again reinforced, and again received the same polite rejection; 'upon which,' says Heylin, 'the tempter departed from him.'[3] Now surely the English people might be pardoned for entertaining suspicions of the designs of a Court at which, under the king's own eye, offers were thus boldly made, and thus gently declined, for making the Archbishop-elect of Canterbury a prince of the Church of Rome.

But upon this part of the subject I have, perhaps, already said enough in my last lecture, and indeed the time remaining will hardly allow me to say more. I will therefore pass on, without further preface, to mark some of the principal and most striking features in which the teaching of the Laudian divines differs from that of their predecessors under Elizabeth, and in the earlier part of King James I.'s reign. But when I speak of the current teaching of the Laudian divines, you are not by that term to understand anything like the current teaching of the Church of England during Charles I.'s reign. It was the teaching, to be sure, of those theologians who were most in favour with the Court, and very active measures were taken to make it the teaching of all who were in any place of authority; insomuch that when old Bishop Morton was asked what the Arminians held, he replied jocularly that they held all the best bishoprics, deaneries, and benefices in England. But down to the very catastrophe which involved all our institutions in the ruin of the counter-Reformers of that period, they had never succeeded in their attempt of stamping their own character upon the general teaching of the Church. I do not mean only that they were unable to change in any

---

[3] Heylin, *ubi supra.*

respect conformable to their views the Liturgy and other formularies of our Church, but that they were not able to modify to any great extent the language held by persons in place of authority in the Church; so that all through that reign there remained a succession of prelates and other divines who stood aloof from the Puritans on the one side and the counter-Reformers on the other, and continued on pretty faithfully the tradition of the Elizabethan theology, such as, for example, Ussher, Hall, Downham, Davenant, and many others. In speaking then of the change of teaching which took place in Charles I.'s reign, I am speaking of a partial, not a total change. And I think the most noticeable characteristics of that change may be observed in the views taken by the new school upon the nature of Episcopacy, of the Sacraments, and of the subjects involved in the Arminian and Calvinistic controversies. These do not, indeed, comprise all the most striking characteristics, but they comprise most of those then definitely brought in question which were of permanent and radical importance. There were others more popularly striking, and some, perhaps, more really fundamental; but these popular ones were of a more transitory and superficial kind, and the deeper ones were hardly, at the time I speak of, adequately grasped and appreciated by either party. Of the former class was the question whether the Pope was Antichrist. The affirmative of this seems almost to have been treated as an article of faith by some of the first Reformers, and the mooting of it Laud endeavoured by every possible means to prevent; insomuch that his earnest maintenance of that old dogma of the Reformation seems to have been the dead fly which marred the savour of Joseph Mede's rich ointment in the nostrils of the distributors of Church patronage, and led them to look coldly upon one who, in other respects, might have fairly expected some favour at their hands in reward of his learned labours to prove the Eucharist a sacrifice and the Christian house of assembly a temple. Of the other class, I may hint an example in the question about the nature of the visible Church; whether it necessarily ought to

form one organised body corporate or not; a question surely of vital importance, and one which lies at the bottom of the whole controversy between Romanism and Protestantism, but which hardly found a definite and prominent place in English theology till the reign of Charles II., when it was so admirably discussed by Barrow in reply to Thorndike.

Setting therefore these aside, I intend, as I said, at present to confine our view to the teaching of the new school upon Episcopacy, the Sacraments, and the Arminian doctrines, as contrasted with that of their immediate predecessors.

And first of Episcopacy.

According to our earlier divines, Episcopacy was viewed as a form of Church government, and as such subject to the inherent mutability which they ascribed to all particular forms of government. In general they regarded this as the original and the best, and as necessary to the well, or better being of a Church; but in no case, as far as I can see, as essential to the being of a Church. And when I say that they generally regarded it as the original and best form, I use the term 'generally' advisedly, and I apply it to our divines as taken both before and after the rise of the Disciplinarian disputes. Certainly there must have been many, and some distinguished exceptions. You remember how distinctly, in a passage which I quoted on a former occasion, George Cranmer, a witness every way unexceptionable, testifies that at first, i.e. in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, 'the greatest part of the learned in the land were either eagerly affected, or favourably inclined towards the Genevan discipline; that the contrary part began to fear that they had taken a wrong course, and that many which impugned the discipline, yet so impugned it, not as not being the better form of government, but as not so convenient for our state.' And even allowing that G. Cranmer's fears somewhat exaggerated the dangers of those times, still, after making all reasonable deductions, it must, I think, be allowed to remain unquestionable that many leading and influential persons in our Church were then so far from thinking Episcopacy bound upon the

Church by divine right, or even the best form of government in itself, that they strongly preferred, or knew not how to refute, the claims of the Presbyterian model. There is a remarkable passage, too, in Hooker, B. VII. xi. 8, which very significantly points out two of our most eminent divines as doubtful at least whether Episcopacy was the primitive form of government, and one of these a person whose sentiments Hooker must have known well, and was under no temptation to construe harshly—I mean Bishop Jewell. 'Although,' says he, 'we should leave the general received persuasion held from the first beginning that the Apostles themselves left Bishops invested with power above other pastors; although I say we should give over this opinion and embrace that other conjecture which so many have thought good to follow, and which myself did sometime judge a great deal more probable than now I do, merely that after the Apostles were deceased, Churches did agree among themselves, for preservation of order and peace, to make one presbyter in each city chief over the rest, and to translate into him that power by force and virtue whereof the Apostles, while they were alive, did preserve and uphold order in the Church, exercising spiritual jurisdiction, partly by themselves and partly by Evangelists, because they could not always everywhere themselves be present: &c.' Then upon the words 'which so many have thought good to follow,' he gives in the margin, amongst others, the names of Jewell and Fulke. Here, therefore, Hooker distinctly allows that two of our most eminent divines of that day regarded the Episcopal government as not directly of even Apostolical institution, and he intimates pretty plainly that he was once of the same opinion himself, and he goes on to show that Episcopacy is nevertheless, even upon that view, capable of being satisfactorily defended, though a mere human institution, against its Puritan assailants.

Upon the subject of its Apostolical institution, however, he afterwards, as we see, changed his sentiments. And the zeal and ability with which he has vindicated that Apostolical institution has led those who know him only from his later

books to regard and cite him as agreeing in the main with the divines of the Laudian school. But such an inference can only be arrived at by neglecting to consider the very first principles of his great work. Of these principles a leading one is this, that it is not the mere circumstance that an institution is divine which makes it unalterable, but either (1) the express word of the imposer declaring it to be so, or (2) the nature of the institution itself.

'If,' says he, B. III. c. x.7, 8, 'the authority of the maker do prove unchangeableness in the laws which God hath made, then must all laws which He hath made be necessarily for ever permanent, though they be but of circumstance only, and not of substance. I therefore conclude that neither God's being author of laws for government of His Church, nor His committing them to Scripture, is any reason sufficient wherefore all Churches should for ever be bound to keep them without change. But of one thing we are here to give them warning by the way. For whereas in this discourse we have oftentimes professed that many parts of discipline or Church polity are delivered in Scripture, they may perhaps imagine that we are driven to confess their discipline to be delivered in Scripture, and that having no means to avoid it, we are fain to argue for the changeableness of laws ordained even by God himself, as if otherwise theirs of necessity should take place, and that under which we live be abandoned. There is no remedy therefore but to abate this error in them, and directly to let them know that if they fall into such conceit they do but a little flatter their own cause. As for us, we think in no respect so highly of it. Our persuasion is, that no age ever had knowledge of it but only ours, &c. If therefore we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us and the strongest against them were to hold even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of Church polity which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all Churches, to all times. But with any such partial eye to respect ourselves, and by

cunning to make those things seem the which are the fittest to serve our purpose, is a thing which we neither like nor mean to follow. Wherefore, that which we take to be generally true concerning the mutability of laws, the same we have plainly delivered, as being persuaded of nothing more than we are of this, that whether it be in speculation or in practice, no untruth can possibly avail the patron or defender long, and that things most truly are likewise most behovefully spoken.'

And again, with the case of Episcopacy distinctly before him: Matters of Church polity are 'not so strictly nor everlastingly commanded in Scripture but that unto the complete form of Church polity much may be requisite that Scripture teacheth not, and much which it hath taught become unrequisite, sometime because we need not use it, sometime also because we cannot. In which respect, for mine own part, although I see that certain Reformed Churches, the Scottish especially, and French, have not that which best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by Bishops, inasmuch as both those Churches are fallen under a different kind of regiment; which to remedy is for the one altogether too late, too soon for the other during their present affliction and trouble: this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them.' [III. xi. 16].

And where he uses the strongest language with respect to Episcopacy as one of the things from its nature of permanent necessity—i.e. necessity to the well-being of a Church—it is not to what is called the Apostolical succession, or the necessity of that exclusive channel for the transmission of orders that his mind reverts, but to the necessity for a controlling jurisdiction: 'forasmuch as where the clergy are any great multitude, order doth necessarily require that by

degrees they be distinguished. We hold there have ever been, and ever ought to be in such case, at leastwise two sorts of ecclesiastical persons, the one subordinate unto the other; as to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always since, we find plainly both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the Word and Sacraments have been.' [III. xi. 20.] The requisites of such an Episcopacy, one the necessity of which rests only on the nature of the jurisdiction, are plainly as much answered by Prussian Superintendents or Danish Bishops as by our own.

Bear ever in mind therefore, that according to the principles of our earlier divines the Apostolic institution of Episcopacy by no means inferred its absolute and indispensable necessity, nor yet the still stronger term, divine right. 'If,' says F. Mason, in his 'Defence of the Orders of the French Protestant Churches,' 'if by *jure divino* you mean that which is according to Scripture, then the preheminence of Bishops is *jure divino*, for it hath been already proved to be according to Scripture. Secondly, if by *jure divino* you mean the ordinance of God, in this sense also it may be said to be *jure divino*. For it is an ordinance of the Apostles, whereunto they were directed by God's Spirit, even by the Spirit of prophecy, and consequently the ordinance of God. But if by *jure divino* you mean a law and commandment of God, binding all Christian Churches universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted, in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it to be *jure divino*.'

How little, however, Laud was disposed to acquiesce in such moderate views as these is evident from a remarkable letter of his to Bishop Hall, which Heylin has preserved for us. Hall had written a book upon the 'Divine Right of Episcopacy,' and had sent a sketch of the plan of it to Laud, then Archbishop of Canterbury, for his advice and suggestion. And Laud's keen remarks shew at once how in this as well as in other cases, it was resolved to do it 'thorough,' and also to illustrate the difference between the new school

which he represented, and the older one, of which Hall was the representative. 'You define,' he says, 'Episcopacy by being joined with imparity and superiority of jurisdiction; but this seems short, for every Archpresbyter's or Archdeacon's place is so, unless you will define it by a distinction of order. I draw the superiority not from the jurisdiction which is attributed to Bishops *jure positivo*, but from that which is intrinsical and original. Again you say, that where Episcopacy hath obtained, it cannot be abdicated without violation of God's ordinance. This proposition I conceive is *inter minus habentes*, for there never was any Church yet where it hath not obtained. In your second head you grant that the Presbyterian government may be of use where Episcopacy may not be had. First, I pray you consider whether this concession may not be needless here, and in itself of dangerous consequence. Next, I conceive there is no place where Episcopacy may not be had if there be a Church more than in title only. Thirdly, since they challenge their Presbyterian faction to be Christ's kingdom and ordinance, and cast out Episcopacy as opposite to it, we must not use any mincing terms but unmask them plainly, nor shall I ever give way to hamper ourselves for fear of speaking plain truth, though it be against Amsterdam or Geneva. And this must be sadly thought on.'[4]

---

[4] *Life of Laud*, Part II., p. 97, Dublin Edition, 1719.

LECTURE X.

LAUDIAN THEOLOGY—(continued).

Gentlemen,—It may seem to you perhaps, at first, that there is little or no connection between the true characteristics of the Laudian movement which I have enumerated, that is, the tenets of the indispensable necessity of Episcopacy, of what is called the Sacramental system, and of Arminianism; and that their coexistence as the badges of a party was only one of those accidents which frequently occur in the history of parties, giving a casual but strong coherence to elements not naturally related. It would have puzzled the great Cornelius Scriblerus himself to point out any essential connection between cropped hair and republicanism, or the colours blue and buff and the principles of Whiggery. But the Roundheads seem to have cropped their hair because the Cavaliers wore it long, and the Whigs chose blue and buff because those colours chanced to be Mr. Fox's livery. The possibility, therefore, of such casual but close combinations in the phenomena of party developments is not to be doubted.

But, in the present case, I think you will perceive upon reflection that there is more than a mere casual connection between the sentiments which I have enumerated.

The Sacramental system, for instance, and the high doctrine of the indispensable necessity of Episcopacy, have clearly a natural coherence combining them together. If you hold that all the functions exercised by the clergy are potentially in the laity also, and that the limitation of their actual exercise to the clergy is merely for the sake of order and good government, it is difficult to avoid holding also the view

of our earlier divines which regards all particular forms of government in the Church as mutable in their own nature; or at least such a view seems to do away with the necessity for tracing out an unbroken Episcopal succession; since upon that view the importance of the Episcopal, like that of any other magisterial office, would consist rather in the nature and extent of the jurisdiction exercised, than in the line or pedigree of its descent. No one doubts that a king *de facto*, once he is universally recognised and submitted to in the state without a competitor, answers the purposes of royalty as if he had been the legitimate descendant of a long line of princes in direct and unbroken line from Melchizedek; or that the sole reason why, in an hereditary monarchy, the succession is limited to a particular family, and to the firstborn in that family, is to prevent disputes and uncertainty about the person of the prince. 'The difference,' says Tertullian, in a passage which some admirers of antiquity are not willing to be reminded of, 'the difference between the clergy and the people was made by the Church, and the honour of that order consecrated by assigning to them a separate consistory; so that, where there is not such a clerical consistory, you, though a layman, baptize and make the oblation, and are your own priest. Where three are gathered together there is a Church, though they be all laics. For each man lives by his own faith, and there is no respect of persons with God, since according to the Apostle's declaration, it is not the hearers of the law that are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. If therefore thou, a layman, hast the right of the priesthood in thee, where necessity requires it, you ought to submit to the discipline proper to priests, where it is requisite that you should have the rights of a priest.'[1] And again in another place: 'The chief priest, i.e. the Bishop, has the right of conferring baptism, next the Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the Bishop's authority, out of respect to the Church, by the maintenance of which peace is maintained. Apart from that consideration

---

[1] *Exhort. ad Cast.* vii.

laymen also have that right. . . . But if thou art a layman, be content to use your right only in cases of necessity, when the circumstances of time or place or persons compel you.'[2] And again, giving instances of the force of Church rules in modifying the discipline of the earlier times, he instances in the Lord's Supper: 'Which Sacrament,' says he, 'Christ instituted after supper, and commanded all to perform, but which we receive also in the morning, and only from the hands of the presiding elders.'[3] I think the language of Hooker, B. III. c. xi. § 18, falls in exactly with this view:

'The matters wherein Church polity is conversant are the public religious duties of the Church, as the administration of the Word and Sacraments, prayers, spiritual censures, and the like. To these the Church standeth always bound. Laws of polity are laws which appoint in what manner these duties shall be performed.

'In performance whereof, because all that are of the Church cannot jointly and equally work; the first thing in polity required is a difference of persons in the Church, without which difference those functions cannot in orderly sort be executed. Hereupon we hold that God's clergy are a state which hath been, and will be, as long as there is a Church on earth, necessary by the plain Word of God Himself.'

According to such views as these, the grounds of the limitation of certain functions to the officers of the Church would be, in general, the same as the ground of limiting certain functions to the officers of the State, namely, the peace and good order of the community. The necessity for such officers would be derived, not from the powers which they exercised being such intrinsically as common Christians could not exercise, but from the anarchy which would result if every one was left to exercise them at his own will and pleasure—if every one that thought himself competent were left to teach and preach and administer the rites of the Church, whenever, and wherever, and however it might suit his own fancy.

[2] *De Baptismo*, xvii.

[3] *De Coronâ Militis*, iii.

And following out the analogy of civil matters, those who held such a view would be apt to say, that as some states are better and some worse constituted, and yet we do not deny the name and rights of a state to any community which has any tolerable constitution at all; so, though some one particular form of Church government may be the best—i.e. may best answer the general ends of government—yet where those ends are answered to any reasonable extent by an inferior form, we cannot deny that what is essential to the mere being of a Church is at least preserved.

But what is called the Sacramental view of Church rites would materially alter the elements of this calculation. According to the Sacramental view, the act of consecrating the material object makes a real change in that object—not merely attaches to it a certain signification, not merely converts it into a sign and pledge, and in that way a means of grace, but gives it new supernatural qualities, and effects a union, like a physical union, between it and certain divine graces. The power of consecrating Sacraments, therefore, in this view, is the power of working miracles; a power specifically different from anything which is potentially or actually inherent in all Christians as such, or which results from the general ends of good order and regularity. The powers which a society can give to its officers are powers which reside originally in the whole society, but this is quite a distinct power from any such. And therefore it is, in the Sacramental view, quite natural to consider the essential powers of the priesthood as falling under the analogy of other miraculous gifts, transmitted through an exclusive channel by a succession of men who represent and inherit the privileges of the Apostles. It is in this way, no doubt, that gifts of healing or of tongues would have been perpetuated in the Church, if they had been designed to be perpetuated at all; and it is natural that those who regard the powers of the priesthood as similar miraculous gifts should conceive of them as thus perpetuated.

From these brief hints you will easily, I think, for yourselves detect the thread which connects the doctrine of the

Apostolical succession (in the later exclusive sense of it) with the Sacramental system.

As to the connection of these same views with Arminianism, the case stands somewhat differently. The Sacramental system and the Apostolical succession are so connected that each is visibly inane and imperfect without the other. But it is not so with the Sacramental system and Arminianism. The Sacramental system indeed requires Arminianism as a condition of its development, or at least, and to speak more properly, it requires the negation of Calvinism. But Arminianism does not require the Sacramental system, and has in itself no tendency to produce it. The overlooking this important distinction was one grand error of Charles I.'s Parliaments, which all along confounded Arminianism with the more properly Romanistic tendency of the Laudian party. But the mistake was natural, both because it was certainly in their Romeward movement that those divines came upon the Arminian doctrines as necessary to their position, and because just at that time the Arminians proper (i.e. the Dutch Remonstrants) being bitterly persecuted by their Calvinistic fellow-Protestants, began to suffer themselves to be deluded by vain promises of charity on the part of Roman Catholics; and their great leader, Grotius, had conceived a showy but unsubstantial plan of comprehension, by which the schisms of the Reformation were to be healed, and Western Christendom reunited in one body again with the Bishop of Rome.[4] But these negotiations with Rome were only a transient cloud passing over the Remonstrant community. The essential Protestantism of their genius soon showed itself in a manner not to be mistaken. And in England, not only were the doctrines of the Arminians eagerly adopted by several of the Independents, the most uncompromising of all enemies of hierarchical principles; but the study of the works of Grotius, Episcopius, and Limborch by the theologians of our own Church, broke up the Laudian party itself, and produced two

---

[4] See his *Via ad Pacem*, Works, vol. iii. p. 533 seqq. amongst his *Opuscula Diversa.*—EDITORS.

new schools—one of which were called the Latitude men: such as Cudworth, More, Tillotson, and, by a continual descent, Clarke, Hoadly and his followers; and another of a moderate and non-mystical race of Higher Churchmen, to whom belonged Barrow, Sharpe, Aldrich, Sherlock, Waterland, Seed; and whose posterity remain among us under the popular appellation of the 'High and Dry.'

But to return: the connection of the Laudian party with Arminianism arose, I think, from this—that Calvinism is repugnant to the Sacramental system, whereas Arminianism, if we mean thereby merely the tenets of Arminians upon what are technically called the five points, is indifferent to that system, may subsist with it or without it. But when I speak of the Sacramental system as characteristic of the Laudian divines, let not such language lead you to expect to find in them generally, or indeed in any of them, such broad and bold statements of it as you may probably have seen in recent publications of the modern Tract party, for example, by Wilberforce. Such statements as his were, I believe, never made by any man in the Reformed Church of England before our days. I do not say that none of the divines of Charles I. may not in their own sentiments have gone as far, but certainly none of them ever ventured plainly to avow such sentiments. Hardy and even rash as they were in defying public opinion, they could not then have thus openly defied it. The times would not have borne it. The Pope could not then openly, and almost avowedly, keep a recruiting depôt in the benefices and dignities of a Protestant Church. But the same tendencies were manifest enough to attentive observers. Let us confine ourselves for the present to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

I think the idea of some physical or hyperphysical change in the elements themselves, some spiritual quality attached to the bread and wine themselves, some indwelling of the Divine presence in them, seems to be involved in Laud's strange ceremonies at St. Catherine Cree before described.[5]

---

[5] See Lecture VIII. of this series.—EDITORS.

At least such ceremonies tended naturally to produce such an idea. And his extraordinary zeal to turn the communion tables into altars, to remove them to the east end of the church, to fence them about with rails and ward off the laity to a respectful distance, fell in at least with such an idea. And so did also the continual and unexplained repetition of the term Real Presence, which became a watchword with the party, a term capable no doubt of a sound sense, but capable also of a very wrong one; a term expressly repudiated by the Church in King Edward's time,[6] and generally laid aside as dangerous by our theologians of the more Protestant periods, and never used by any of them without careful explanation of the sense in which they used it. 'Since,' says a sensible and charitable writer, Parr, the biographer of Ussher, 'this expression of a Real Presence of Christ's Body was not maintained by our first Protestant Reformers, nor used by the Church of England in her articles, I do not see of what use it can be now (though perhaps only meant in a spiritual sense by most that make use of it: for the real presence of a Body and yet unbodily, I suppose those that speak thus understand as little as I do), unless that some men love to come as near the Papists as may be in expression, though without any hopes now of making them approach nearer to us, and in the meantime giving matter of offence and scandal to divers ignorant and weak Christians of our religion.' The truth is, that an unexplained phrase of this kind, put forward continually as a term of great significance, suggestive of a false but capable of a right sense, is a most convenient engine to work with. It may be made the ready means of infusing, with tolerable safety to the users, just as much error as the times will bear. But lest you should think that in speaking thus you are listening to the vulgar slang of mere irreverent Low Churchmen, let me support what I have said by the authority of a person beyond all exception—I mean Dean

---

[6] 'It becometh not any of the faithful,' says one of Edward's Articles, [De Cœn. Dom.] 'to believe or profess that there is a real or corporal presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist.'—AUTHOR.

Aldrich of Christ Church, Oxford—than whom no man, I believe, was more honoured by the High Church party of the seventeenth century.

'It is easy,' says he, 'to conceive how a thing that is locally absent may yet be really received; as we commonly say, a man receives an estate or inheritance when he receives the deeds or conveyances of it. The reception is confessedly real, though the thing itself is not locally or circumscriptively present or literally grasped in the arms of the receiver. . . . Now though it be easy, as I said, to conceive how a natural substance may be said to be really received though not locally present, it is not so easy to conceive it really present when at the same time it is locally absent. Therefore the Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of Real Presence in all the books which are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church's, nor Nowell's Catechism. So that if any Church of England man use it, he does more than the Church directs him. If any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him.'[7]

He goes on to say, however, that it may be safely used among scholars, if correctly defined. And so far I agree with him; and for a correct definition, I am glad to be able to give one from a Doctor of Charles I.'s reign, a friend and client of Laud's own, but who in this and in many other respects is a noble exception to the censures I am compelled to pass upon most of the fraternity—J. Taylor. He has used the term, but not left it unexplained. The title of the treatise from which I quote is, 'The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.'

'Now that the spiritual is also a real presence, and that they are hugely consistent, is easily credible to them that

---

[7] See the extract from his *Reply to Two Discourses*, a scarce pamphlet printed in 1687, in Waterland's *Review*, pp. 260–1. In a note to the Bishop's Charge of 1867 he gave a part of this quotation as taken by him from Waterland.—EDITORS.

believe that the gifts of the Holy Ghost are real graces, [and a spirit is a proper substance:] . . . And when things spiritual are signified by materials, the thing under the figure is called true, and the material part is opposed to it as less true or real. The examples of this are not infrequent in Scripture. The tabernacle into which the High Priest entered was a type or figure of heaven. Heaven itself is called σκηνὴ ἀληθινὴ, the true tabernacle, and yet the other was the material part. And when they are joined together, i.e. when a thing is expressed by a figure, ἀληθῆ, true, is spoken of such things, though they are spoken figuratively: Christ the true light &c.; He is also the true vine, and *verè cibus*, truly or really meat, and the true bread from heaven, and spiritual goods are called the true riches: and in the same analogy, the Spiritual Presence of Christ is the most true, real, and effective; the other can be but the image and shadow of it, something in order to this: for if it were in the Sacrament naturally or corporeally, it could be but in order to this spiritual, celestial, and effective presence; as appears beyond exception in this, that the faithful and pious communicants receive the ultimate end of his presence, that is spiritual blessings; the wicked, who by the affirmation of the Roman doctors do receive Christ's Body and Blood in the natural and corporal manner, fall short of that for which this is given, that is, of the blessings and benefits.'[8]

[Catechism.]—'Verily and indeed.'

[Cranmer.]—'Where I use to speak sometimes (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the Sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter; that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward Sacrament, but sometimes of his Sacramental Presence; and sometimes by this word Sacrament, I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the Sacraments. And so the old writers many times do say that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the Sacraments, not meaning by that manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, and wine; but

---

[8] *Real Presence*, sec. 1, 6, Works, vol. vi., pp. 14, 15, ed. Eden.—EDITORS.

that in the due ministration of the Spiritual Sacrament, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace in all them that worthily receive the same. Moreover, when I say, and many times repeat in my book, that the Body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words and think that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them; this is to advertise the reader that I mean no such thing. But my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's Body that was crucified for us, and His Blood, that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacrament. But all this I understand of His Spiritual Presence, nor no more truly is He corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than He is in the due ministration of Baptism, that is to say, in both spiritually by grace.'[9]

[Keble on Hooker.]—'We acknowledge that Hooker lays down certain limitations under which the idea of the real presence is to be received;' but adds, 'the one drift and purpose of all these limitations is to prevent any heretical surmise of our Lord's manhood now being, or having been at any time since His Incarnation, other than most true and substantial. Whatever notion of the real presence does not in effect interfere with this foundation of the faith, the genuine philosophy of Hooker, no less than sound theology, taught him to embrace with all his heart. No writer since the primitive times has shown himself in this and all parts of his writings more thoroughly afraid of those tendencies which in our age are called Utilitarian and Rationalist.'[1]

Now let us hear Master Hooker himself.

'The real presence of Christ's most Blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.'[2] 'Whereas Popish doctrine doth

---

[9] *Answer to Gardiner*, Pref., p. 3, ed. Parker Society.

[1] Preface to Hooker, p. lxxxiii.

[2] *Eccl. Polity*, v. lxvii. 6.

hold that priests by words of consecration make the real, my whole discourse is to show that God by the Sacrament maketh the mystical Body of Christ; and that seeing in this point as well Lutherans as Papists agree with us, which only point containeth the benefit we have of the Sacrament, it is but needless and unprofitable for them to stand, the one upon Consubstantiation the other on Transubstantiation, which doctrine they neither can prove, nor are forced by any necessity to maintain, but might very well surcease to urge them, if they did heartily affect peace and seek the quietness of the Church.'[3]

I know not what Mr. Keble calls this in Hooker, but in a smaller man he would be apt to call it Utilitarian.

'They pretend that to Sacraments we ascribe no efficacy, but make them bare signs of instruction or admonition; which is utterly false. . . . "God by Sacraments giveth grace:" (saith Bernard) "even as honours and dignities are given; an abbot made by receiving a staff, a doctor by a book, a bishop by a ring;" because he that giveth these pre-eminences declareth by such signs his meaning, nor doth the receiver take the same but with effect; for which cause he is said to have the one by the other: albeit that which is bestowed proceed wholly from the will of the giver, and not from the efficacy of the sign.

'They, to derive grace in Sacraments from the very sign itself, . . . are so wrapped about with clouds and mists of darkness, that neither other men's wits can follow, nor theirs lead to any manifest and plain issue. . . . Were they not as good to say briefly, that God's omnipotent will causeth grace, that the outward sign doth shew His will, and that Sacraments, implying both, are thereby termed both signs and causes, which is the self-same that we say? Their motions and intimations to make signs in themselves seem causes do amount to no more in very deed than that they

---

[3] MS. note to p. 33 of the *Christian Letter*, Keble's Hooker, vol. ii. p. 354.—EDITORS.

are signs. And as we understand not how, so neither can they express in what manner they should be more.[4]

'Granted it is and agreed upon, that he who hath not the Son of God in him hath not life. But how to construe this we are to seek; some thinking it a point inexplicable, a mystery which all must hold, but none is able to open or understand. Others considering that, forasmuch as the end of all speech is to impart unto others the mind of him that speaketh, the words which God so often uttereth concerning this point must needs be frivolous and vain, if to conceive the meaning of them were a thing impossible, have therefore expounded our conjunction with Christ to be a mutual participation whereby each is blended with other, His Flesh and Blood with ours, and ours in like sort with His—which gross and material conceit doth fight openly against reason. For are not we and Christ personally distinguished? Are we not locally divided and severed each from other? "My little children," &c. Did the blessed Apostle mean materially and really to create Christ in them, flesh and blood, body and soul? No: Christ is in us . . . not according to that natural substance which visibly was seen on earth, but according to that intellectual comprehension which the mind is capable of. So that the difference between Christ on earth and Christ in us is no less than between a ship in the sea and in the mind of him that builded it; the one a sensible thing, the other a mere shape of a thing sensible. That whereby the Apostle therefore did form Christ was the gospel. So that Christ was formed when Christianity was comprehended. As things we know and delight in are said to dwell in our minds and possess our hearts, so Christ, knowing his sheep and being known of them, loving and being loved, is not without cause said to be in them, and they in Him.'[5]

[Homily.]—'In the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent.'

---

[4] Fragments of Answer to the *Christian Letter*, Keble's Hooker, Appendix I. to Book V., vol. ii. pp. 554–556.—EDITORS.

[5] Hooker, Serm. III., vol. ii. pp. 710–11. Oxford, 1865.

'We must take heed, lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion it be made a private eating; lest of two parts we have but one; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive.'

We must 'have a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world, . . . but also that He hath made upon the cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee. . . . Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, [no mass], no means established by man's invention.'[6]

[Bishop Andrewes.]—'Præsentiam credimus non minus quam vos veram; de modo præsentiæ nil temerè definimus.'[7]

---

[6] Homily *Of the worthy receiving the Sacrament.*

[7] *Answer to Bellarmine*, c. i. p. 11.—This Lecture completes the original plan as far as the Great Rebellion. It was to have been continued to the Revolution of 1688. Dr. FitzGerald's appointment to the Bishopric of Cork, in the spring of 1857, when the later Lectures of this series appear to have been composed, has deprived us of his views on a period with the religious history of which he was thoroughly conversant, and on which he would no doubt have thrown the light of his brilliant genius.—EDITORS.

APPENDIX.

We have thought that it would not be amiss to give by way of Appendix a few documents referred to in the foregoing Lectures. Some of these would probably have been appended by the Bishop, if he had published these Lectures himself. What we have thus appended are important, and do not readily offer themselves to the notice of general readers.

We shall first present the earlier part of the Essay on the Epistle of Barnabas, the latter part of which we have transferred to the second Lecture of the Second Course, vol. i. pp. 149 sqq., for reasons there explained. In giving here the earlier part, it is right to remind the reader that the paper was printed in 1838, and was one of the earliest of the Bishop's writings. It is to be remembered that since then the entire of the Greek text of the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas has been recovered, and that an extensive literature has grown up about it. Whether the Bishop would have adhered to everything in this paper, after all the subsequent discussions that have taken place, it is impossible to say. The matter contained in it is, however, in itself of the highest value, and the paper will interest the reader as one of the earliest writings of the gifted author.

The contents of this Appendix will, therefore, be as follow:—

I. Remarks on the Epistle of St. Barnabas.

II. Peter Oliva, and the opinions ascribed to him.

III. Extracts from William de St. Amour and Richard of Armagh.

IV. Articles from Wickliffe's writings condemned by the Council of Constance.

V. Articles of J. Huss enumerated in the sentence of his condemnation.

VI. Rosinus and Spalatinus on a saying of Erasmus to the Elector Frederick.

VII. Overtures of the Lutherans to the Greek Church.

I.

Remarks on the Epistle of Saint Barnabas.

Of all the collection of ancient writings which compose the works of what are called THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS, the Epistle of St. Barnabas is, perhaps, the most remarkable, in regard of the importance of the person to whom it is ascribed; the early period in which it appears to have been recognised as his; and the favour which it has met with in later times from some of our most acute and learned critics. Mr. Jeremiah Jones, however, in his laborious and useful work upon the Canon of the New Testament, has endeavoured to shew that, so far from being the genuine production of the Apostle whose name it bears, it is an Alexandrian forgery of the beginning of the second century, and has supported this opinion by some strong and, I think, convincing reasons. But although I fully adopt his *conclusion*, yet truth obliges me to confess that I differ with him about one of his *premises*—viz., that the author was a *Gentile*; I think he was a *Jew*; and as, if my argument be good, it will complete his proof, by shewing that either supposition will lead to the same inference, I will take the liberty of stating it here, as briefly as possible. Its strength consists in these five propositions:—

I. That the author was a Jew.

II. That, being a Jew, he made use solely of the Septuagint Version.

III. That his *peculiar* mystical exegesis of Scripture is precisely similar to that of *Philo*, and the *Alexandrian* School.

IV. That those who first quoted and commended it were *Alexandrians*, and very warm admirers of that philosophical way (as it was thought) of interpreting Scripture.

V. That the hypothesis of its being an *Alexandrian* forgery accounts for its ascription to St. Barnabas.

I. That the author was a Jew I argue (as all good critics before Mr. Jones had done) from the deep acquaintance he shews, not only with the Old Testament, but with Jewish *traditions* and *apocryphal* books. That the fact is so, the reader needs only to run his eye over the annotations of Menardus and Bishop Fell in Le Clerc's edition, to be convinced. I will not burthen him, therefore, here with a repetition of them; but only add, that there is an instance of the same thing in a passage which I quote below for another purpose, Barnab. *Epist.*, § ix., ed. Voss.,

where he makes the number of Abraham's *trained servants* the same as the number of those he circumcised; and this confusion has greatly perplexed the commentators. But the source of it was this, that the Rabbins held these הניכים to have been proselytes *trained up*[1] in the knowledge of the true God; and the same they maintain to have been signified by the אנשי ביתו in the 17th chapter. See Vossius upon Maimonides, *De Idololatr.*, cap. 1, § 9. Now we know from Philo-Judæus, περὶ τῆς περιτόμης, that the *Alexandrians* were great supporters of tradition; and it is notorious that apocryphal books were at that time highly valued by the philosophic school of Jews, and that the chief mint of such books was at *Alexandria*.

Such considerations as these inclined (as I said) all good critics before Mr. Jones to conclude that the author of this Epistle was, at any rate, a Jew; but since he is very positive that the author himself says the contrary, it will be necessary to examine what he has alleged.

1. His first proof is derived from these words of Barnabas: 'Before that *we believed in God*, the habitation of our hearts was corruptible and feeble, as a temple truly built with hands. For it was a house full of IDOLATRY, a house of devils; inasmuch as there was done in it everything contrary unto God.' Upon which he bids us remark that the Jews could not be said to have believed in GOD, nor to have had IDOLATRY in their hearts. This objection Bishop Fell had anticipated, by 1st, quoting 1 Peter iv. 3, a passage addressed by a Jew to Jews; 2nd, by observing that idolatry is not to be understood here literally of the worship of graven images, but of the practically adoring other objects besides God. On the learned prelate's first reply I shall not insist, because the reading which he relied on has been called in question; but I hope to shew presently that his second observation (however slighted by Mr. Jones) is the true answer to an objection, urged with too great precipitancy, and founded upon a mutilated extract. But, to take things in order, I say that the unconverted Jews might be truly affirmed not to have believed in God, inasmuch as they had not a *saving* faith in Him, which could *purify their hearts* (the very thing here treated of), and did not believe in Him as He revealed Himself—i.e. *in His Son.* Nay, had Mr. Jones so much as looked at the beginning of this very section, he would have found the author himself explaining

---

[1] Cf. Prov. xxii. 6, חנוך לנער, *train up* a child, &c.

how the Jews might be affirmed not to have believed in God; for he says, *ἔτι καὶ περὶ τοῦ* Ναοῦ *ἐρῶ ὑμῖν πῶς πλανώμενοι οἱ ταλαίπωροι ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν* (fors. *τὸν οἶκον* [2]) *ἤλπισαν καὶ* ΟΥΚ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ, *κ.τ.λ.* This haste and inaccuracy, in so able and diligent a writer, I know not how to account for; more especially as the rest of his objection is but a repetition of the same blunder. For, let anyone look at the whole section from which the place is taken, and he will see that the Pseudo-Barnabas is there treating of the heart as the true spiritual temple, which it becomes when God dwells there: *ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν· πῶς; ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως, ἡ κλῆσις αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἡ σοφία, κ.τ.λ. . . . αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν . . . ἀνοίγων ἡμῖν θύρας τοῦ* ΝΑΟΥ *κ.τ.λ.* p. 246, ed. Voss. Hence it is plain that, whenever any other master had possession there, it might truly be called 'a house full of idolatry, a house of devils.' So St. Paul tells us that every covetous man is an *idolater*; and to the same purpose is our Saviour's parable of the lapsed demoniac, to which, I think, there is here a plain allusion. And that this is the true sense of the place appears still more plainly from the words immediately following—'It was a house full of idolatry, a house of devils; *inasmuch as there was done in it whatsoever was contrary to God.*' So the author of the homily *De libero Arbitrio*, usually printed among the works of St. Basil, but which the Benedictine editors pronounce to be spurious upon what appear to me very insufficient grounds (Tom. II. Præf. p. xxvi.): *οὔπω γεγόναμεν* ΝΑΟΣ *θεοῦ, καὶ οἰκητήριον Πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἔτι γὰρ ἔσμεν ναὸς εἰδώλων καὶ δοχεῖον πνευμάτων πονηρίας*, Tom. II., p. 614.[3] And so also an excellent modern author, who (most likely) was thinking very little of Barnabas at the time: 'If, therefore, any *Israelite* desires to have this blessedness, this true Shechina, dwelling in his heart, he must depart from pride and from all iniquity. He must cleanse the *temple* from all *idols.*'—*The Personality, &c., of the Holy Spirit*, by the Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D.

But, 2, Mr. Jones objects that the writer plainly draws a distinction between Jews and Gentiles, and always ranks himself among the latter; as for instance in Section V., where he says,

---

[2] The very learned Father Lumper, in his *Historia Sanctorum Patrum*, vol. i. p. 178, conjectures *οὖδος*, and supports his conjecture with some ingenious criticism.

[3] Jortin (*Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*) cites a passage of *Valentinus*, preserved by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* ii. p. 489, very similar to this, Book i. p. 212.

'Scriptum est enim de illo quædam ad *populum Judæorum*, quædam ad *nos*.' [*Sic, juxta Græcum.*]

But to understand this we must recollect what this author's doctrine is. He holds that the whole Jewish law is to be mystically understood as a system of moral precepts addressed to Christians—the spiritual Israel; and this was the legitimate conclusion which a convert from the refined Therapeutic School of Alexandria[4] would draw from his old principles. For they held that the Mosaic code was only understood literally by the gross and carnal, but was meant to be taken spiritually by the perfect philosopher. In this way, as Philo tells us, they explained away the command to offer sacrifices: *οὐ ζῶα καταθυόμενοι, ἀλλ' ἱεροπρέπεις τὰς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας κατασκευάζειν ἀξιοῦντες·*[5]—which, the reader needs not to be told, is precisely the theology of this Epistle. Now, the only change which it was necessary to make in this system, in order to accommodate it to Christianity, was to put *believers* in the place of the spiritual or perfect; and it is in this sense that we find the Pseudo-Barnabas distinguishing himself from the Jews because they followed the letter, neglecting the spirit, of their law—and identifying himself with the Gentiles (not simply as Gentiles, but) as believers in Christ—i.e., as *spiritual Jews*. Of this he discourses at large in §§ 5 and 10, edit. Voss.

3. Nor is Mr. Jones's last objection at all more to the purpose, being grounded only upon this, that the style of this Epistle is, in the main, free from Hebraisms. But now, suppose the author an *Alexandrian* Jew, and this argument (otherwise of some weight) makes rather for than against me, since the famous

---

[4] The reader will find much valuable information on the spirit and tenets of the Alexandrian Jews in Neander's *Church History* (Rose's Trans. vol. i.) and Dr. Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iii., p. 65 to the end.

[5] This disparagement of the literal sense of the Mosaic code soon made its way into the Church. 'Neque ethnici solum,' says Spencer, 'et Christiani aliquot illiterati, sed et PATRES nonnulli (quod fateri piget) legibus illis contumelias ingerunt.' *Proleg. ad Tract. de Legg. Heb.* c. iii. s. 1. So Origen, *In Levit.* Hom. 5: 'Hæc omnia [præcepta de sacrificiis] *nisi alio sensu accipimus quàm literæ textus ostendit*, cum in ecclesiâ recitantur, *obstaculum* magis et *subversionem* Christianæ religionis quàm rationem et edificationem præstabunt.' This, however, was not the general opinion of the Church, for Homil. 13 *In Genesin*, he complains thus: 'Si ergo incipiam et ego veterum dicta discutere, et sensum in iis quærere spiritalem, si conatus fuero velamen legis amovere, et ostendere allegorica quæ scripta sunt, fodio quidem puteos, sed statim mihi movebunt calumnias AMICI LITERÆ—veritatem negantes stare nisi super terram.'

Septuagint Version (if there were nothing else) proves the Jews of that city to have wholly lost their native language.[6] And this brings me to my Second Proposition, which was,

II. That this author makes use solely of the Septuagint Version; a thing which any one who has read the Epistle in the original needs not to be told.[7] But there is one famous passage in it, which contains an absurdity so gross that no one who did not regard that version with the same reverence as the Hebrew text could possibly have fallen into it:—'Learn then, my children, concerning all richly, that Abraham, who first gave us circumcision, looking forward in the Spirit to his son, circumcised *his domestics*, taking the mysteries (δόγματα, vid. *Casaub. c. Bar.* p. 11, Exer. xvi. 43) of three letters; for *the Scripture* says:—"And Abraham circumcised of his house ten, and eight, and three hundred men." What, then, was the knowledge given to him? Learn first of the eighteen, then of the three hundred. Now as to ten and eight, I is ten, and H eight. You have IHσους. . . . He manifests then Jesus in two letters (ι.η.), and the cross in one (T). *He who hath set in us the engrafted gift of instruction knoweth that none ever learned a more genuine doctrine from me than this.* But I know that ye are worthy of it.'

This notable piece of theology is introduced, you see, with all the seriousness and solemnity of a man fully confident of the importance of the discovery which he is about to make; and he

---

[6] See Dr. Mangey's *Præfat. in Philonem.*

[7] Besides that given in the text, another *decisive* instance is to be found in his citation of Isaiah xlv. 1, where he reads Κυρίῳ for Κύρῳ, a mistake which one who knew Hebrew could not have fallen into. Two instances of an apparent departure from the LXX have been shewn by Mr. Jones (*On the Canon*, vol. iii. pp. 16 and 103) to arise from his taking the citations of St. Matthew and St. John as he found them in their Gospels. Two others, brought by Dr. Hody, agree as little with the Hebrew as the Greek, and are obviously loose quotations from memory; the first is Esai. xxviii. 17: ὃς ἐλπίσει ἐπ' αὐτὸν, ζήσεται εἰς αἰῶνα· where, however, the ancient Latin Version has *non confundetur*, which makes it likely that the true reading of the Greek is οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται, which is the lection of some MSS. of the LXX. The other is from Gen. ii. 1: καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἓξ ἡμέραις τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ, where, as Menardus has remarked, he has plainly mixed up the place in Exodus along with it. The late excellent editor of the Septuagint having quoted this passage of Barnabas, and another from Theodorus, as possible evidence that some MSS. of the LXX had ἑβδόμῃ, adds: 'Sed Barnabæ Epist. 45, 46, et fortè 65, et Theodorus ostendunt se ἕκτῃ legisse; literarum ϛ et ζ similitudo facilè potuit librarios fallere.'

seems wholly unconscious of the complication of absurdities which it involves. I appeal to the reader, whether it is possible for anyone to have made so capital a blunder who did not regard the Greek text with all that habitual superstitious reverence for its *verbal*, and even *literal* inspiration, which the Jews generally feel for the original Hebrew. Even with this excuse the error is so exorbitant as itself to be a sufficient proof (if it were necessary) that St. Barnabas could not be the author of such a production. But it seems less absolutely unaccountable when we recollect the romantic fables[8] by which the *Alexandrian* Jews contrived to raise their version to a level with the sacred archetype.

III. His allegorical way of explaining Scripture is precisely the same as that of Philo and the Alexandrian School; that Philo from whom, according to *Photius*, the deluge of allegory was first derived into the Christian Church.[9] The proof of this proposition also, has been so carefully laboured by the commentators that it would be superfluous in me to spend time in establishing it. Rosenmüller, in the second chapter of the *History of the Interpreters before Origen*, has put some of the most remarkable parallels in a very striking light. Or the reader may turn to so common a book as Grotius, *De Verit.*, lib. v. c. 9, adding to the passages there cited Philo, *Hist. Joseph.*, p. 360 (edit. Turneb.), and περὶ ἀποικίας, p. 270. Or, if he wish for further satisfaction, let him consult Spencer's Prolegomena to his treatise *De Legibus Heb. Rit.*, Clemens Alex., *Pæd.* lib. ii. c. 1, and Le Clerc's elaborate Commentary on the Pentateuch, on the places cited by Barnabas.

The learned Brucker has satisfactorily traced the origin of the *Gematraija*, or Numerical Cabbala (of which we have just seen so rare an example in this Epistle) to the dregs of Pythagorism, which finally settled at Alexandria. To such a source,[1] the name גימטריא, *γεωμετρία*, seems evidently to point. For as geometry—the indigenous science of Egypt—is that one which soonest and best developes the powers of arithmetic, the Egyptians

---

[8] Philo, *De Vitâ Mosis*, lib. ii. p. 660 (Parisiis, 1640): καθάπερ ἐνθουσιῶντες προεφήτευον. A little below he adds that the LXX are to be looked on, not as interpreters (ἑρμηνεῖς), ἀλλ' ἱεροφάντας καὶ προφήτας. I need not add the history of Aristeas.

[9] Ἐξ οὗ οἶμαι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀλληγορικὸς τῆς γραφῆς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ λόγος ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν εἰσρυῆναι. Phot. *Biblioth. Cod.* cv.; cf. Porphyr. apud Euseb. *H.-E.* lib. vi. c. 19.

[1] *Glassii Philol. Sacra*, lib. ii. pars 1, Tract. ii. sect. 3. But Rosenmüller (in lib. sup. cit.) seems to prefer συμμετρία.

were presently remarkable for their knowledge of it; and it was the policy of that nation (all whose philosophers were priests) to involve all their *learning* in *mystery*, so this simple science was, in a short time, by means of fanciful analogies with morals and metaphysics, wrapped up (like one of their own mummies) in a fantastic robe, all covered with strange figures and hieroglyphics. So Isocrates, the best informed of the Greek rhetors, tells us that, in Egypt, *τοὺς νεοτέρους ἐν Ἀστρονομίᾳ καὶ λογίσμοις, καὶ γεωμετρίᾳ διατρίβειν· . . . ὧν τὰς δυνάμεις οἱ μὲν. . . . οἱ δὲ ὡς πλειστῶς πρὸς Ἀρετὴν συλλαμβανομένας ἀποφαίνεις ἐπιχείρουσι* (*In Laud. Busirid.*).

From the Egyptians it was borrowed by the Samian philosopher, and by him made a part of his motley system, as he that is curious may see plentifully illustrated in the 'As Pythagoricus' of the laborious Meursius.[2] From Pythagoras again it returned, with the last wreck of his disciples, to its native port, when with other irregularities of his school it was adopted by the Therapeutæ[3] into their semi-pagan Judaism. From the Synagogue it was soon transferred into the Church; where, however, the use which the heretics made of it, in no long time, brought it into disrepute. *Ἄξιοι δὲ πενθοῦς*, says Irenæus, *οἱ τηλικαύτην θεοσεβείαν, καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀληθῶς ἀρρήτου δυνάμεως, καὶ τὰς τοσαύτας οἰκονομίας τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦ* A *καὶ* B, *καὶ δι' ἀριθμῶν, οὕτως ψυχρῶς καὶ βεβιασμένως διασύροντες.*—Iren., 'C. Hær.,' lib. i. c. 13. So the author of the additions to Tertullian's *Præscriptions* says of Marcion and Colarbasus: 'Quòd ex ordine literarum alphabeti, *luso quodam cabbalistico*, multa inepta et periculosa dogmata extruxerunt, abusi ad hoc exemplo Christi qui Apoc. i. 8, inquit, Ego sum A

---

[2] Brucker, I find, wrote a separate dissertation to show that Pythagoras' *Numbers* were the same as Plato's *Ideas*. An instance of much the same arithmetical extravagance may be seen in Dr. George Cheyne's *Principles of Nat. Rel.* part 2.

[3] See *Clerici Prolegomena ad H. E.* pp. 26, 27. For an account of the Numerical Cabbala see the following: Glassius ut suprà; Reuchlin, *De Cabbalâ Judaicâ*; P. Galatinus, *De Arcan. Cath. Verit.* lib. ii. c. 17; Hottinger, *Phil. Thes.* lib. i. c. 3, § 5, p. 437; and Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*, Book ii. c. i. Reuchlin and Gale have observed the great resemblance between Cabbalism and Pythagorism; but as might be expected, in such hands, it becomes a proof that the Greeks borrowed all their learning from the Jews. Gale's method of proving the Talmudic traditions Pythagorean is rather singular 'The Pharisees,' says he, 'call them *τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, believing them to have been delivered down orally from Moses; but our Lord calls them *ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων*—i.e. of *the Pythagorean philosophers*.'

et Ω.' Absurdities so extravagant would be almost wholly incredible, had we not unfortunately too many late examples of the same thing in the reveries of Hutchinson and Cocceius. Some Christian writers have, indeed, fairly beaten the Jews at their own weapons, as when they extract the name ישו from the dimensions of the ark and Solomon's temple, with a thousand other feats. But the reader who will consult S. Epiphanius *De Myss. Num.* will get a better idea than I could give him of what profound sense there is in *Scripture Arithmetic*. Epiph., 'Opera,' edit. Petav., vol. ii. p. 305.

Another favourite point with the same school was their mystical precepts concerning diet, much in the same taste as Barnabas' wonderful discourses upon the Mosaic laws on that subject. The Egyptians, like the Jews, observed a distinction of food, but, in general, for a different reason—viz., because they thought some animals *too sacred* to be eaten; as we may see in Herodotus, *Euterpe*, c. 65, and Calcagninus, *De Rebus Egypt.* p. 230.[4] The *source* of this most degrading of all superstitions has been well shewn by Warburton, 'D. L.' Book iv. sect. 4, to have lain in their method of hieroglyphic writing. But the *practice* itself, when a necessity arose for vindicating it, was of course defended by the hyper-Platonic sophists of the Alexandrian School, on the same principle as *animal worship*—that is, by saying that these brutes were considered as the SYMBOLS of intellectual entities.—See Jamblichus, *De Myss.* sec. vii. c. 1, and Vossius, *De Idol.* lib. iii. c. 74. But they also, like the Jews, abstained from some animals under the notion of their being *polluted*; the origin of which superstition, I think was this: the whole learning of that extraordinary people was, as is well known, confined to the priesthood, who were the only practitioners of medicine in Egypt. Now these physicians prided themselves (as Diodorus tells us, *Bibl.* lib. i. p. 52) particularly on their skill in *diætetics*; and in order to induce the vulgar to observe implicitly the regimen which they ordered, they soon took advantage of their own sacred character to throw a mysterious air of religious observance over their prescriptions, representing everything which they deemed *unwholesome* as *polluted* and *impure* also. But when the inquisitive philosophers of Greece came to pry into these venerable secrets, it was necessary in

---

[4] The heathens, judging of others by themselves, sometimes believed that the Jews thought the pig a *sacred* animal. Plutarch, *Sympos.* lib. iv. quæst. 5.

this case, as well as the other, to invent a symbolical meaning, which should conceal the true and simple reason under the specious mask of a moral emblem. This device, also, was borrowed by Pythagoras; an explanation of whose precepts upon diet, very closely resembling our author's, may be seen in the commentary of the Alexandrian philosopher, Hierocles, on the *Golden Verses*, p. 294, edit. Warren. When the Jews, after the great Captivity, began to study their law with a more curious eye than their forefathers had generally turned upon it, they found a great deal that harmonised with, and much that went beyond, the purest dictates of that philosophy with which they had now become acquainted. But the philosophy which was so happily applied to the elucidation of the *moral law*, and to the explaining of many things both in it and the prophets concerning the sublimer parts of natural theology, seemed to fail altogether of affording any light to the ceremonial. And their minds being now wholly set upon speculative science, they were little disposed for the religious explanation which lay so much out of the way of their present studies, and still less inclined to acquiesce in these rites—as their ancestors had done—simply because they were enjoined; and accordingly they soon followed the tempting example of the Pythagoreans and resolved the whole Mosaic ritual into a mass of theoretic and moral allegories. In this spirit, Philo, speaking of the distinction of clean and unclean animals, says, *πρὸς τὴν ῥητὴν ἐπίσκεψιν, οὐκ οἶδα ὃν ἔχει λόγον, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ὑπονοίαν ἀναγκαιότατον*—*De Agric.* p. 160.

IV. The first who cites this Epistle is Clemens Alexandrinus; the next Origen.[5] Both were of the School of Alexandria, and both much attached to allegorical expositions and vain philosophy. Barnabas everywhere represents his strange mysticism as the true *γνῶσις*, and everyone who is acquainted with their writings knows that this is the uniform language of these two Fathers. The name, for instance, which Clemens all along gives to his Perfect Christian is *ὁ αληθὴς γνωστικός*. But on this I have no

---

[5] I was greatly surprised to find Mr. Faber (in the Appendix of his *Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*), citing Tertullian, *De Pudicitiá*, cap. 20, as a testimony to this Epistle; because, if he had looked at the place itself, he must have seen that Tertullian is there speaking of *the Epistle to the Hebrews*, which he attributes to St. Barnabas. Indeed the thing is so notorious, that one is surprised to see the learned author fall into the mistake under any circumstances.—See Ussher's *Preface to the Ep. Barnab.* in the first vol. of Le Clerc's *P. P. Apostolici*.

room here to dilate, and can only refer the reader to the excellent note of Grotius on Matthew xxviii. 20, and Suicer's article, in his *Thesaurus*, on the word γνῶσις.

V. In support of my fifth proposition I observe that . . . . .

[The remainder of this paper, which we owe to Archdeacon Kyle, having been drafted into Lecture II. of the Second Course, the reader is referred for it to pp. 149 sqq. of the first volume.]

II.

Peter Oliva.

In Lecture XI. of Course III., vol. ii. p. 103, reference is made to the writings of Peter Oliva. We subjoin here the account of his heresies given by Eymericus in his *Directorium Inquisitorum*, pt. ii. pp. 268 sqq., translated from the original work, Romæ, 1585.

The Errors of Peter John.

'The first heresy is: that the sixth state of the Church, which began, as he says, from the time of Blessed Francis, and more fully from the time of the condemnation of the great whore of Babylon, when the angel of Christ sealed with a seal by his attendants the future army of Christ, and it will last until the time of Antichrist; and will be notably preeminent above the five first.

'The second heresy is: that as at the first Advent of Christ a new Church was formed, the old Synagogue being rejected, so also in the beginning of the sixth state the antiquity of the former time is to be wholly repelled, so that a new age, or a new Church may seem to be then formed, the old ones being now rejected. And as in the sixth period carnal Judaism being rejected, and the antiquity of the former age, Christ, the new Man, came with a new law, life, and the cross: so in the sixth state the carnal Church being rejected and the antiquity of the previous age, the law and life and cross of Christ will be renewed: on which account at its first beginning Francis appeared, marked with the stigmas and crucified whole, and sealed with Christ.

'The third heresy is: that as the glory which had been prepared for the Synagogue and its priests, if they had believed in Christ, was transferred to the primitive Church and to its pastors: so also the glory prepared for the final Church of the fifth state, on account of its wickedness, has been transferred to the elect of the sixth state.

'The fourth heresy is: that it is evident that the Rule of the Friars Minor, promulgated by Blessed Francis, is truly and properly that evangelical one which Christ observed in Himself and imposed on the Apostles, and caused to be written in His Gospels.

'The fifth heresy is: that the rule of Blessed Francis is to be condemned by the generality from the carnal Church, and of those that are wickedly and sophistically proud, as Christ was condemned by the reprobate Synagogue of the Jews; and that this must precede the extermination of the Church, as the condemnation of Christ and His by Jews preceded the extermination of the Synagogue.

'The sixth heresy is: that Blessed Francis is that Angel of whom it is said in the Apocalypse: "I saw another angel having the seal of the living God:" the renovator of the evangelical life and rule to be propagated and magnified in the sixth and seventh time, and its highest observer after Christ and his Mother.

'The seventh heresy is: that it is fitting that the condemnation of the rule of the Blessed Francis should precede the extermination of the carnal Church, for this, that by the just judgment of God, the carnal Church, as it has deserved, should be excited, and its wickedness increase, and be consummated[6] even to the impugning of life and the Holy Spirit.

'The eighth heresy is: that generally all clerks and regulars possessing anything in common seem to have less correct sentiments respecting the evangelical abrenunciation of such possessed in common.

'The ninth heresy is: that as the Synagogue was propagated from twelve Patriarchs, and the Church of the Gentiles from twelve Apostles: so the final Church of the remnant of Jews and Gentiles is to be propagated by twelve evangelical men: whence Blessed Francis had twelve sons and associates by whom and in whom has been founded and initiated the Evangelical Order.

'The tenth heresy is: that the third tribulation pierced the hands by the appearance of the famous authority of the Church and of the plebeian multitude subject to it, and by the appearance of the contrary in spiritual men.

'The eleventh heresy is: that the Angel Francis will feel that he is not so prosperous in the carnal Church of the Latins,

---

[6] Printed *consumetur*, but plainly, both by grammar and sense, an error for *consummetur*.

as in the Greeks, and Saracens, and Tartars, and at length in the Jews.

'The twelfth heresy is: that all abbots of the fifth time will come together into the head of the beast, which is the devil or Antichrist, and the congregation of the wicked.

'The thirteenth heresy is: that that Church which we call the Universal Catholic Church Militant is the carnal Church, the harlot Babylon, great in extent: because good men are in it, as a few grains of gold amidst immense heaps of sand, and as a few grains of wheat under an immense heap of straw, which carnal Church also is publicly and most shamelessly adulterate from Christ her spouse: which also corrupts itself and all nations subject to it by foul carnalities and simoniacal covetousnesses, and by the earthly glory of this world, which even now has blazed out into wrath against spiritual men, and against the powers and influxes of the Holy Spirit; which has also fallen spiritually within, and corporally without, and which has fallen in the world by temporal extermination; afterwards has fallen to eternal punishment in hell; and which by its malice and power has hindered and straitened the spirit of the elect, and the conversion of the whole world; which also is to be exterminated, and its extermination will be to the saints like the coming out of prison to the wideness and flight of liberty, and as the coming out of the darkest smoke of an oven into the solar light, and like the taking off the load of a mill-stone or of an immense mountain.

'The fourteenth heresy is: that as through four animals representing the four first states of the saints the general seat of the Roman Church has been elevated, the other Patriarchal or Oriental Churches being rejected from Christ and from his true faith; so during the same time by the four beasts seen by Daniel, contrary to the four first orders of the Saints, the seat of the beast has been elevated, that is of the bestial troop, so that it prevails in number and power, and almost absorbs the Seat of Christ with which it is locally and nominally mixed; whence also it is so called the Church of the faithful, just as that which is really by grace the Seat and Church of Christ. But upon wickedness of this kind the jealous saints of this fifth period cease not to pour out the vial of detestation, and of public rebuke, so that its kingdom, whether it will or not, appears plainly to all, and even to themselves, full of darkness, that is, by foul and enormous luxury and avarice, and simony, and pride, and deceitful traffic and craft, and almost by all wickedness dissipated and to be held in

abomination; whence also it is afterwards called the harlot Babylon, having in her hand a golden cup full of abomination. But by this seat of the beast is principally designed the carnal clergy, reigning in this fifth period, and presiding over the whole Church; in which, indeed, beastly life transcendently and singularly reigns, and sits as in its principal seat; and far more than in the plebeian laity subjected to themselves.

'The fifteenth heresy is: that in the time of the mystic Antichrist, the carnal Church, [by which in his entire proceeding he understands the Roman Church], blazing out more fiercely against the doctrine and life and zeal of the Saints, is as it were wholly drained of spiritual wisdom, and virtual grace, and the riches of Christ, as was the case with the Jews and the Greeks, so that it lies open to every error.

'The sixteenth heresy is: that as Vashti the Queen, having been rejected from the kingdom and marriage of King Assuerus, the humble and holy Esther was elected to the marriage and kingdom of the same king, and the king made a magnificent feast for all his princes and servants; so the Synagogue having been rejected, the Church of the fulness of the Gentiles was elected; and so in the sixth state of the Church the adulteress Babylon being rejected, the Spiritual Church must be exalted, and a numerous and spiritual feast be celebrated after her nuptials.

'The seventeenth heresy is: that under the mystic Antichrist a subversion and commotion is to be effected by which time the entire carnal Church will be excited and be in commotion against the evangelical spirit of Christ.

'The eighteenth heresy is: that under the mystic Antichrist, the harlot Babylon, the carnal Church, will fall, at which time the holy Fathers will preach valiantly, saying that henceforth she is not the Church of Christ, but the Synagogue of Satan, and the habitation of demons, which before in her heart used to say, proudly exalting herself: I sit a queen in great presidence and glory, I rule over my kingdom, and I am in quiet and am not a widow; that is, I am not destitute of glorious bishops and kings.

'The nineteenth heresy is: that the Roman Church is that woman, the great harlot, of whom mention is made in the Apocalypse, who was formerly in a state of paganism, and afterwards was in the faith of Christ, who now by many crimes has committed fornication with this world, who is deservedly called the great harlot, because receding from the faithful worship and sincere love, and the delights of Christ her spouse, she clings to this

world, and to its riches and delights, and to the devil, and to kings and magnates and prelates and all other lovers of this world.

'The twentieth heresy is: that it more appropriately belongs to the doctors of the third general state, which is the sixth and seventh, to be spiritual openers, introducing into open doors, or explainers of Christian wisdom, than to the Apostles.'

Besides this account of the heresies of Peter Oliva, there exist sixty articles selected from his *Postils on the Apocalypse*, published by Baluze, as noticed in the Lecture referred to above. These are much to the same effect as the statements of Eymericus, only more minute and expository of the Apocalyptic text. The more important of these may be found in Dr. Todd's *Discourses relating to Antichrist*, Dublin, 1840, in pp. 480, 1.

Bzovius, *An. Eccl.* ad an. 1099, xxxix., after mentioning that Peter John's books had been condemned and burned, and that his remains had been exhumed and burned also, gives the following account of his errors:—

'1. He denied, first of all, that the rational soul is the form of the human body, not absolutely indeed, but in so far as it is rational; he conceded further that the rational soul is the form of the body, not however on this account, that it is rational; further that he thought as if by this rationality it could not give form (*informare*) to the body.

'2. He taught, with the Abbot Joachim, that the Apostles did not preach the gospel of Christ according to the spiritual understanding, but only according to the letter.

'3. He said that grace, and the virtues which they commonly call theological, are not infused in baptism.

'4. He asserted that Christ sustained the wound of the spear while he was yet alive. [Cf. an old reading of Matt. xxvii. 49, 50.]

'5. By the great harlot Babylon he understood the Universal Church Militant, and called it the carnal Church, and the beast, and the Synagogue of Satan.

'6. By the mystic Antichrist he interpreted the Chief Pontiff, and he blethered that all abbots of the fifth time come together into the fifth head of the beast, and were a congregation of the wicked.' Bzovius refers for his statement to Gabriel Prateolus, *Elenchi Heresium*, c. 14, in Petro Joannis.

It is to be remarked that the Franciscans themselves have defended Oliva. See the references for this fact in Todd, *ubi supra*.

III.

William de St. Amour, and Richard of Armagh.

The following is the sequel of the extract from William de St. Amour's *De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum*, given in the second Lecture of the Fourth Course, vol. ii. pp. 86, 7. We take it from Bishop Stillingfleet, *Idolatry Practised in the Church of Rome*, pp. 403 sqq., ed. 1676.

After the word 'dioceses' in l. 4 of vol. ii., p. 87, the extract proceeds as follows :—

'And that the Pope in this case doth injury by violating the rights of others: and if he should go about to destroy what the Prophets and Apostles have taught, he would err in so doing. "Besides," say they, "if these Prædicant Friars have a liberty to preach where they please, they are all universal Bishops; and because maintenance is due to all who preach, the people will be bound to pay procurations to them, which will be an unreasonable burden upon them." Many other arguments they use against this new sort of itinerant preachers, and represent the dangers that come to the Church by them at large, wherein they describe them as a kind of hypocritical Lecturers, that abused the people under a fair shew and pretence of religion; having, as they say, "a form of godliness, but denying the power of it:" and that the persecution of the Church by them would be equal to what it was by tyrants and open heretics, because they are familiar enemies, and do mischief under a shew of kindness. And that one of the great dangers of the Church by them would be their possessing princes and people with prejudices against the government of the Church by the Bishops; which having done, they can the more easily lead them into errors both against faith and a good life. That their way of dealing is first with the women, and by them seducing the men, as the devil first tempted Eve, and by her Adam; and when they have once seduced them, they tie them by oaths and vows not to hearken to the counsel of their Bishops or those who have the care of their souls. That the Bishops ought to suppress these, and call in the public help to do it, and to purge their dioceses of them: and that if they do it not, the blood of the people will be required of them, and destruction will come upon them for it; and though princes and people had taken their part, that ought not to discourage them; but their folly ought to be manifest unto all

men. After this they lay down the means to be used for supporting them and the signs for their discovery, saying that they are idle persons, busybodies, wandering beggars, against the Apostles' express command, who would have all such excluded from the Church as disorderly livers: and therefore conclude with an earnest exhortation to all to have a care of the Church, and to rise up against them as the pernicious enemies of its peace and welfare.'

The work of which the foregoing is an abstract, represents the views of the University of Paris, at whose desire it was drawn up, and by whose authority it was published.

Immediately after the quotation from St. Amour in Course IV. Lect. II., follows a reference to Richard of Armagh. The passage from his *Defensorium Curatorum* to which the Bishop referred is thus given by Stillingfleet, in the same work, p. 414: 'Coming to London about some business of his See, he found great disputes about the privileges of the Friars; and being desired to preach, he made seven or eight sermons, wherein he declared his mind against them, both as to their order and privileges; in which he followed the doctrine of the divines at Paris, above an hundred years before delivered by them upon the like occasion;' (plainly the work of St. Amour is here intended), 'asserting it not to be in the Pope's power to grant such privileges which destroy the rights of the parochial clergy or the jurisdiction of the Bishops.'

Some extracts from this work of Richard of Armagh, given by Archbishop Ussher in his *Religion Professed by the Ancient Irish*, Works, vol. iv., pp. 301, 2, ed. Elrington, which I have compared with Richard's original work, are here subjoined:—

'For now in these times scarce shall any great or mean man of the clergy or the laity eat his meat but such kind of beggars will be at his elbow: not like poor folk humbly seeking alms at the gates or doors (as Francis in his testament commanded and taught) by begging; but intruding into courts or houses, and taking up their lodging therein, without being in any manner invited, they eat and drink what they find among them; and not the less carry away with them by extortion corn, or meal, or loaves, or flesh-meats, or cheeses (though there may not be more than two in the house): nor shall any be able to refuse them, unless he should cast away natural shame.'—*Def. Curat.* pp. 56, 57, Paris, 1625. We have slightly varied the Archbishop's translation of this passage. Again:—

'The first conclusion was, that our Lord Jesus Christ in his human conversation was always poor, not because for his own sake he chose or wished for poverty.' (pp. 104–5.)

'The second conclusion was that our Lord Jesus Christ never spontaneously begged.' (Ibid. p. 107.)

'The third conclusion was, that Christ never taught to beg.' (Ibid. p. 121.)

'The fourth conclusion was, that our Lord Jesus Christ taught that men ought not spontaneously to beg.' (Ibid. p. 123.)

'The fifth conclusion was that no one can prudently and with piety take upon himself spontaneous mendicity to be maintained perpetually; inasmuch as from the time that such mendicity or begging has been dissuaded by Christ, by his Apostles and disciples, and by the Church and Holy Scriptures, and was even reprobated, it follows that it cannot be assumed in this manner with prudence or piety.' (Ibid. p. 131.)

We may add the following, translated from Ussher's *Hist. Dogmat. de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis*, Works, vol. xii. p. 345, ed. Elrington :—

'A.D. MCCCLVIII. RICHARDUS, ARMACHANUS ARCHIEPISCOPUS.

'A year or two before his death, he hid in a certain wall of his church, the New Testament of Christ (perhaps translated by himself) in the Irish tongue : at the end of which, as if prophesying, he wrote this : "When this book shall have been found, the truth will be manifested to all the world, or Christ will presently appear on earth." And this book was discovered about the year from the birth of Christ 1530, when the church was undergoing repair.' (John Bale, formerly Bishop of Ossory in Ireland, in *Script. Brit.*, Centur. 14, p. 246.) John Fox also (*Act. et Mon.*, p. 381, Lond. 1596) thinks that our Richard was the author of a translation of the Bible into the Irish tongue, of which certain Englishmen of approved fidelity had assured him that ancient copies had been seen by them. Of such a Bible fragments are extant here and there in Ireland. But neither is this to be omitted, that Armachanus, in the *Defensorium Curatorum* objects to the Friars, that by their means, so great a penury of books had been occasioned, that when he had himself sent from Ireland four of his presbyters to Oxford, they wrote him back word that they had been able to find neither the Bible nor any other theological book suitable for their studies; which also

afterward Geoffrey Chaucer objected to them in these words: "Freer, what charitye is this, to gather up the books of holy write, and put them in a treasorye, and so emprison them from secular preestes and curatts, and by this councell lett them to preach the gospell freely to the people!" (In Jack Upland, ap. Fox, p. 240.)'

In his *Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit*, Works, vol. iii. p. 574, Ussher mentions him as 'Richard of Armagh, whom my countrymen commonly do call St. Richard of Dundalk, because he was there born and buried.' He is said to have died at Avignon on the occasion mentioned in the Lecture, but his remains might have been brought back to Ireland. His full name was Richard Fitz-Ralfe. He was no doubt of Anglo-Norman descent.

IV.

Wickliffe.

The following are the forty-five Articles charged against Wickliffe, and included in the sentence of condemnation pronounced against his works at the Council of Constance.

1. 'The substance of material bread, and likewise the substance of material wine, remains in the Sacrament of the Altar.'

2. 'The accidents of bread do not remain without a subject in the same Sacrament.'

3. 'Christ is not in the same Sacrament identically and really in proper corporal presence.'

4. 'If a Bishop or Priest is in mortal sin he does not ordain, does not duly celebrate [*conficit*], does not consecrate, does not baptize.'

5. 'It is not established in the gospel that Christ ordained the Mass.'

6. 'God ought to obey the devil.'

7. 'If a man has been duly contrite, all outward confession is superfluous, and useless to himself.'

8. 'If a Pope be reprobate (*præscitus*)[1] and wicked, and by consequence a member of the devil, he has not power over the faithful given him by any, unless it may be by Cæsar.'

9. 'After Urban VI. no one is to be received as Pope, but we should live in the manner of the Greeks under our own laws.'

10. 'It is contrary to Sacred Scripture that ecclesiastical men should have possessions.'

---

[1] See *infra*, p. 292.

11. ‘No prelate ought to excommunicate anyone, unless he previously knows that he has been excommunicated by God: and he who thus excommunicates is from thence a heretic or excommunicated.’

12. ‘A prelate excommunicating a clerk who has appealed to the king or to a council of the kingdom, is by that same a traitor to the king or kingdom.’

13. ‘Those who leave off to preach or to hear the Word of God on account of the excommunication of men are excommunicated, and in the day of judgment will be accounted traitors to Christ.’

14. ‘It is lawful for any deacon or priest to preach the Word of God, without the authority of the Apostolical See, or of a Catholic Bishop.’

15. ‘None is a civil lord, none is a prelate, none is a bishop, whilst he is in mortal sin.’

16. ‘Temporal lords may at their discretion take away temporal goods from a Church, from convents having possessions that are habitually delinquent; i.e. from habit, not delinquent by an act.’

17. ‘Private people may, at their discretion, correct delinquent lords.’

18. ‘Tithes are pure alms, and parishioners may at their discretion take them away on account of the sins of their prelates.’

19. ‘Special prayers applied to one person by prelates or religious, do not benefit the same more than general, other things being alike.’

20. ‘He who confers alms on friars is by that act excommunicated.’

21. ‘If anyone enters a private religion of whatever kind, whether of those having possessions or mendicant, he is rendered more inapt and unfitted for observing the commandments of God.’

22. ‘Saints instituting private religions have sinned by so instituting them.’

23. ‘Religious living in private religions are not of the Christian religion.’

24. ‘Friars are bound to gain a livelihood by the labours of their hands.’

25. ‘All are simoniacal who oblige themselves to pray for others that supply them in temporals.’

26. ‘The prayer of the reprobate (*præsciti*) avails none.’

27. 'All things happen by absolute necessity.'

28. 'The Confirmation of the young, the Ordination of clerks, the Consecration of places, are reserved to the Pope and Bishops on account of the desire of temporal gain and honour.'

29. 'Universities, studies, colleges, graduations, and masterships have been introduced by vain gentility, and only benefit the Church as the devil does.'

30. 'The excommunication of the Pope or of any Prelate is not to be feared, because it is the censure of Antichrist.'

31. 'Those that found cloisters sin, and those that enter them are diabolic men.'

32. 'To enrich the clergy is contrary to the rule of Christ.'

33. 'Pope Sylvester and the Emperor Constantine erred in endowing the Church.'

34. 'All of the order of Mendicants are heretics; and those that give them alms are excommunicated.'

35. 'Those that enter a religion or any order, are by that fact unfitted for keeping the divine precepts, and, by consequence, for reaching the heavenly kingdom, unless they have apostatised from the same.'

36. 'The Pope with all his clergy having a possession, are heretics by the fact that they have a possession, and those that consent to them, *videlicet*, secular lords and other laymen.'

37. 'The Roman Church is a Synagogue of Satan, neither is the Pope the immediate and nearest Vicar of Christ.'

38. 'The Decretal Epistles are apocryphal, and seduce from the faith of Christ; and the clerks who study them are fools.'

39. 'The Emperor and secular lords have been seduced by the devil to endow the Church with temporal goods.'

40. 'The election of the Pope by the Cardinals has been introduced by the devil.'

41. 'It is not necessary to salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme amongst other Churches.'

42. 'It is fatuous to believe in the indulgences of the Pope and Bishops.'

43. 'Oaths are unlawful which are made to confirm human contracts and civil dealings.'

44. 'Augustin, Benedict, Bernard, have been damned, unless they repented of this, that they had possessions and instituted and entered religions, and so, from the Lord Pope even to the lowest religious, all are heretics.'—Apud Bzovium, *An. Eccl.* 1415, fol. 396–7.

V.

John Huss.

The following are the Articles alleged in the final sentence of the Council of Constance against Huss to have been contained in his writings, and accordingly appended to the sentence :—

1. 'There is only one holy Universal Church, which is the entire number of the predestinate, [and below follows]: The holy Universal Church is only one, as the number of all the predestinate is only one.'

2. 'Paul was never a member of the devil, although he may have done certain acts similar to the acts of those who are malignant against the Church.'

3. 'The reprobate' (*præsciti*, foreknown, used in opposition to the predestinate) 'are not parts of the Church, since no part of it finally falls away from it, inasmuch as the charity of predestination, which binds it together, never fails.'[1]

4. 'The two natures, divinity and humanity, are one Christ.'[2]

5. 'The reprobate, although he be sometimes in grace according to present righteousness, nevertheless is never part of the holy Church; and the predestinate always remains a member of the Church, though he may sometimes fall away from adventitious grace, but not from the grace of predestination.'

6. 'By taking the Church for the convocation of the predestinate, whether they be in grace or not in respect to present righteousness, in that way the Church is an Article of faith.'

---

[1] The word *præsciti*, foreknown, was used in the discussions on predestination to denote those who were foreknown to be finally impenitent. It was adopted in order to avoid the supposition of a decree of reprobation.

[2] The heresy in this proposition is not clearly indicated. As in the Arian controversy the disagreement was about one letter ι in the words *homoousios*, or *homoiousios*, so in after times the controversy about the two natures in Christ turned on the difference between ἐκ and ἐν, whether our Lord existed, ἐκ, of two natures, or two natures existed, ἐν, in our Lord. The Monophysites acknowledged the former, but denied that there remained two natures in Christ. On the other hand, the Nestorians acknowledged both, but understood by the two natures two distinct personalities. A reference to the earlier questions of the third part of the *Summa Theologiæ* of Thomas Aquinas will shew how easily a heresy might be alleged to lie hid under the words, 'Two natures, divinity and humanity, one Christ.'

7. 'Peter was not, nor is, the head of the holy Catholic Church.'

8. 'Priests living in any manner criminously, pollute the power of the priesthood, and as unfaithful sons think unfaithfully of the Seven Sacraments of the Church, of the keys, offices, censures, manners, ceremonies and sacred things of the Church, the veneration of relics, indulgences, and orders.'

9. 'The papal dignity grew as a graft from Cæsar, and the præfecture and institution of the Pope emanated from the power of Cæsar.'

10. 'No one without a revelation would rationally assert of himself or of another that he was the head of a particular holy Church, nor is the Roman Pontiff head of the Roman Church.'

11. 'It is not right to believe that he, whosoever is a particular Roman Pontiff, is head of any particular holy Church, unless God has predestinated him.'

12. 'No one is Vicegerent of Christ, or of Peter, unless he follows him in manners, since there is no other following more pertinent, nor does he receive from God procuratorial power otherwise, since for this office of Vicar there is required both conformity of manners and the authority of the Institutor.'

13. 'The Pope is not the manifest and true Successor of Peter the Prince of the Apostles, if he lives in manners contrary to Peter; and if he avariciously seeks gain, then he is the Vicar of Judas Iscariot. And by like evidence the Cardinals are not manifest and true Successors of the College of the other Apostles of Christ, unless they shall live in the manner of the Apostles, keeping the counsels and commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

14. 'Doctors laying down that anyone to be emended by ecclesiastical censure, if he will not be corrected, is to be delivered to secular judgment, for certain follow in this the Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees, who when Christ would not obey them handed him over to the secular judgment, saying "it is not lawful for us to put anyone to death," inasmuch as such are more grievous homicides than Pilate.'

15. 'Ecclesiastical obedience is obedience according to the added invention of the priests of the Church, beyond the express authority of Holy Scripture.'

16. 'The division of human works is immediately that they are either virtuous or vicious: because if a man is vicious, and

does anything, he then acts viciously: and if he is virtuous and does anything, he then acts virtuously: because as the vice which is called crime, or mortal sin, stains universally the acts of the vicious man, so virtue quickens all the acts of the virtuous man.'

17. 'A priest of Christ living after his law, and having knowledge of Scripture, and a mind to edify the people, ought to preach notwithstanding a pretended excommunication;' [and further on,] 'that if a Pope or any Prelate commands a priest thus disposed not to preach, the subject ought not to obey.'

18. 'Anyone who comes to the priesthood receives the office of a preacher by command, and ought to execute that office notwithstanding a pretended excommunication.'

19. 'By ecclesiastical censures of excommunication, suspension, and interdict, the clergy supply themselves with a lay people for their own exaltation, multiply avarice, protect malice, and prepare the way for Antichrist. But the token is evident that such censures proceed from Antichrist, which in their processes they call fulminations, by which the clergy proceed most chiefly against those who expose the wickedness of Antichrist, which the clergy will chiefly employ on their own behalf.'

20. 'If a Pope is wicked, and especially if he be a reprobate (*præscitus*), then like Judas the Apostle he is a devil, a thief, and a son of perdition, and is not the head of the holy Church Militant, since he is not even a member of it.'

21. 'The grace of predestination is a bond by which the body of the Church, and any member of it, is indissolubly joined to Christ the head.'

22. 'A Pope or Prelate, wicked and reprobate (*præscitus*) is equivocally a pastor, and really a thief and robber.'

23. 'A Pope ought not to be called most holy, even in respect to office, because else a king ought to be called most holy in respect of office, and torturers and heralds would be called holy, nay, even the devil ought to be called holy, since he is an official of God.'

24. 'If a Pope lives in a manner contrary to Christ, although he should climb up by a due and legitimate election according to the common human constitution, yet he would climb up by another way than by Christ, it being even granted that he entered by an election made in its origin by God; for Judas Iscariot was duly and legitimately elected by God, Jesus Christ, to the Apostleship, and yet he climbed up by another way into the fold of the sheep.'

25. 'The condemnation of the forty-five Articles of Wickliffe made by the Doctors is an irrational and unjust, and an ill-made and feigned excuse alleged by them, *videlicet* from the fact that none of them is Catholic, but any one of them is either heretical, or erroneous, or scandalous.'

26. 'Not from the mere fact that the electors, or the major part of them, have consented vivâ voce according to the rites of men in favour of any person, has that person by that fact been legitimately elected, or by that fact is a true and manifest Vicar or Successor of Peter or the other Apostle' [i.e. Paul] 'in an ecclesiastical office. Whence we ought to believe from the works of the elected whether the electors have chosen well or ill. For by this fact, that anyone more abundantly works meritoriously for the advancement of the Church, has he power from God more abundantly for this.'

27. 'There is not a scintilla of appearance, that there ought to be one head in spirituals governing the Church, which should be always conversant and preserved with the Church Militant itself.'

28. 'Christ, without such monstrous heads, would better regulate His Church by His true disciples scattered throughout the world.'

29. 'The Apostles and faithful Priests of the Lord strenuously regulated the Church in things necessary to salvation, before the office of Pope had been introduced: thus they would do even to the day of judgment, if by a thing most highly possible there should fail to be a Pope.'

30. 'None is a civil lord, none is a prelate, none is a bishop, while he is in mortal sin.'

These articles have been translated from the copy given by Bzovius, *An. Eccl.* 1415, fol. 426–7. It will be seen that the bulk of these articles fully bear out the account which the Bishop gave of the true cause of the condemnation of Huss, in Lecture XIII., Course III. vol. ii. pp. 118 sqq.

VI.

Rosinus and Spalatinus on Erasmus.

In Lecture IV., Course IV., there is an extract from Stillingfleet on Erasmus. In this, vol. ii., p. 178, there is a statement ascribed to Rosinus, this name being there printed by accident

Rosnius. The statement is taken from the *Vitæ III. Saxoniæ Ducum* by Joannes Rosinus, apparently the same whose work on Classical Antiquities has been frequently reprinted. In his 'Life of the Elector Frederick III.' he tells how Frederick sent for Erasmus to Cologne, to inquire of him concerning Luther, wishing to form a fair estimate of his doctrine, and that he asked him, 'quid ipse de Luthero sentiret, quem ferè omnes extremo odio prosequerentur? . . . Respondit ille, ut erat festivus, causam odii istius esse, quod Lutherus duo maxima commisisset peccata, impetens disputationibus suis monachorum ventres et Pontificis coronam.' This book, unpaged, was published at Jena in 1602, and is quoted by Seckendorf, '*Comm. de Lutheranismo*,' L. II., § x. *Additio*, p. 33, in support of the statement of Spalatinus to the same effect.

The statement of Spalatinus, as his words are translated by Jortin, 'Life of Erasmus,' vol. i. pp. 246–7, is as follows:—

'When Charles V. had been just made Emperor, and was at Cologne, Frederic, Elector of Saxony, who was there also, sent to Erasmus, desiring that he would come to his lodgings. Erasmus accordingly waited on him. It was in December; and he and the Prince and Spalatinus conversed together, standing by the fireside. The Elector proposed to Erasmus that he should speak in the Dutch, which was his native language; but Erasmus chose rather to speak Latin: and the Elector understood Latin, though he answered him by Spalatinus. The Elector then desired Erasmus freely to give him his opinion concerning Luther. Erasmus, pressing his lips close together, stood musing, and delaying to give an answer; whilst Frederic, as it was his way when he was discoursing earnestly with anyone, fixed his eyes steadily upon him, and stared him full in the face. At last Erasmus brake out into these words: "Luther hath been guilty of two crimes; he hath touched the Pope upon the crown, and the Monks upon the belly" — Lutherus peccavit in duobus; nempe quod tetigit coronam Pontificis, et ventres Monachorum.' Spalatinus says that the Elector smiled at the expression, and that he called it to remembrance a little before his death. He also says that Erasmus had at that time judged so favourably of Luther's doctrine, that after taking leave of the Elector he immediately wrote some Axioms, as he called them, which he gave to Spalatinus, but afterwards recalled, lest Aleander might see them, and do him an ill office.

VII.

Overtures of the Lutherans to the Greek Church.

In Course IV., Lecture V., vol. ii. p. 200, mention is made of overtures on the part of the Lutherans to the Greek Church through the Patriarch Jeremiah. The following account of this is given in Dupin's *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers, &c.* Wotton's translation, Sixteenth Century, Book IV., Chapter IV., vol. iii. pp. 657–8, Dublin, 1723:—

'The Lutherans of Wittemberg and Thuringen, being desirous to get the Greeks to declare for their opinions, drew unwelcome answers upon themselves. In the year 1559 they tried to surprise the Greeks by sending a copy of the Augsburg Confession, translated into Greek, to Joseph [Joasaph], Patriarch of that See, by the Deacon Demetrius whom he had sent to Wittemberg. Melanchthon sent a Greek letter with it, to invite them to join with the Protestants. The Greeks making no answer to it, Crusius and Jacobus Andreas wrote to the Patriarch Jeremias in 1574, and sent him another copy of the Augsburg Confession, translated into Greek, setting forth in the Preface that they held the Faith of the seven first Councils. The Patriarch Jeremias replied to every article of the Augsburg Confession, disapproving those points in which the Lutherans departed from the belief of the Church of Rome. The Lutherans rejoined, and Jeremias answered their rejoinder, persisting in the same opinions.' Dupin then gives a summary of this reply, which is very much what a Roman Catholic might have written, and then adds: 'And then to free himself from their importunities, he concludes his answer in this manner: "We desire you to give yourselves no further trouble, and not to write or send to us any of your papers any more upon these subjects. You treat these great Lights of the Church, these great Divines, too coarsely; you seem with your mouths to honour them, but in truth you reject them; and you would make their Divine Discourses, which are an arm by which we can confute your notions, useless to us. Thus you will ease us of a pain. Follow your own way, therefore, and write no more to us concerning matters of Faith; but only keep a friendly correspondence with us, if you please."'

This last passage is the conclusion of the third reply of Jeremias, as given in the original Greek in the *Acta et Scripta* of Socolovius, mentioned farther on, p. 370. An account of

this matter was published in Latin in 1582 at Cracow by Stanislaus Socolovius, under the title 'Censura Orientalis Ecclesiæ de præcipuis nostri sæculi hæreticorum Dogmatibus,' dedicated to Gregory XIII. In the Preface to this, Socolovius says that he obtained a copy of two of the letters from an Archimandrite Theoliptus of Constantinople whom he had casually met at Lemburg, who told him that, so far from the reception of the Lutherans into the communion, the Patriarch had confuted their errors.

The following is the conclusion of the *Third Reply* of Jeremias, which I translate from the original Greek, as given by Socoloff in the *Acta et Scripta* of which an account will be given presently:—

'If you therefore, very wise Germans, and beloved children of our mediocrity, are desirous, as sensible men, to come over with all your heart to our most holy Church, we, as affectionate fathers, shall readily welcome your love and good-will; if you will willingly follow the Apostolics and Synodics in conformity with us, and submit yourselves to them. For in that case you will be in real fellowship with us, and as having boldly submitted yourselves to our Most Holy Catholic Church of Christ you will be praised by all sensible people. If in this way, of two Churches one shall by God's good-will be made, we shall henceforth live in unity, and in a joint course of life that is pleasing to God, until we shall arrive at the heavenly kingdom.'

Melanchthon's Letter to the Patriarch Joasaph is to be found in Martinus Crusius's *Turcogræcia*, Appendix to Book VIII., where the Deacon Demetrius is also mentioned, and the sending of the Augsburg Confession. The Letter is dated 1559. It is also printed in Bretschneider, *Corpus Reformatorum*, ix. 921 sqq.

Before I was able to resort to the University Library, Archbishop King's Professor, Dr. Gwynn, furnished me with the following abstract which I give in his own words:—

'The publication, in 1582, by Socolovius, in his "*Censura Eccl. Orient.*," of the Patriarch Jeremias' reply to the German Lutherans, was followed on their part, in 1584, by the publication of the whole correspondence under the title "*Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiæ*" (*Wittemberg*, 1584). It contains:—

'(1.) A Preface, violently assailing Romish errors; accounting for their refraining from publishing the letter sooner; denying

that they had sought to be admitted into communion with the Eastern Church, &c. (written from Tübingen).

'(2.) Two letters (in Greek) from Jac. Andr. and Mart. Crusius to the Patriarch; the first, sent with a copy of the Augsburg Confession in Greek, dated Sept. 15, 1574 (referring to a former letter from same to same); the second,[1] acknowledging a letter from him which appears to have crossed theirs on the way, March 20, 1575.

'(3.) The Confession in full, in Greek.

'(4.) The Patriarch's letter and formal *Reply* (being the same of which Socoloff had published his version) in the Greek, dated May 15, 1576. It is a complete examination, at length, of the Confession.

'(5.) A letter in Greek, signed by Osiander (for Jac. Andreas) and M. Crusius (Tübingen, June 18, 1577); with their *Reply* to his, arranged under heads.

'(6.) The Patriarch's *Second Reply* in Greek, which begins by rejoicing *τῷ ἐν πολλοῖς ὑμᾶς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ συμφωνεῖν ἐκκλησίᾳ.* There are six Articles:—(1) very long, on the Double Procession, (2) Free Will, (3) Justification, (4) Sacraments, (5) Invocation of Saints, (6) Monastic Life. Date, May 1579.

'(7.) Letter (in Greek) signed by Bidembach, Jac. Andreas, Joannes Mageirus, Jac. Heerbrandus, Theodoricus Sueppsius, L. Osiander, Step. Gerlach, and M. Crusius, dated S. Joh. Bapt., 1580, Tübingen, expressing sorrow at the tidings of his deposition, and promising to send printed books; and with it their *Reply to his Second Reply*, under same heads.

'(8.) Letter from him in Greek (still styling himself Abp. of C. P. and Œcumenical Patriarch), thanking them most courteously for their letters and the books which they had sent him in his adversity (*τῆς τύχης πεσούσης*); with his *Third Reply*, dated Constantinople, June 6, 1581. It goes again into (1) The Procession, (2) Free Will, (3 and 4, very briefly) The Sacraments and Invocation of Saints. These last two are strongly adverse to the Reformed doctrines, but in a summary way. *This* letter ends *'Αξιοῦμεν ὑμᾶς μὴ κόπους παρέχειν ἡμῖν, μηδὲ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν γράφειν ἢ ἐπιστέλλειν . . . τὴν ὑμετέραν οὖν πορευόμενοι, μηκέτι μὲν περὶ δογμάτων, φιλίας δὲ μόνης ἕνεκα, εἰ βουλητόν, γράφετε.*

'(9.) They, however, wrote to him, not only a letter (Greek, as before; Dec. 1581) to congratulate him on his restoration

---

[1] 'In this letter they profess to hold the faith as set forth by the *Seven* General Councils.'

but also a brief *Reply to his Third Reply*; under the heads: (1) The Procession, (2) Free Will, (3) Sacraments, (4) Invocation of Saints, (5) Confession, (6) Monastic Life, (7–10) Schisms, The Jews, Heresies, The Fathers—the Patriarch having said that he heard of Jews joining Luther, and having generally accused them of heresy and schism. This is signed as last, with the additional names of Brentius (Tübingen), and (of Stuttgard) Holderer and Schoppfius.

'(10.) Subjoined are letters in Greek: (1) *one* from Heerbrand and Crusius (Tübingen, 1577, Oct. 1), sent with a book written by Heerbrand, and translated into Greek by Crusius (who seems to have rendered all their letters into Greek; the Latin, however, is also given, and a Latin version of the Patriarch's letters); (2) Letter from Patriarch, May 1578, to Jac. Andreas, Heerbrand, Osiander, and Crusius, sent by the hands of Gerlach, who had visited him in Constantinople, promising his *Second Reply*; (3) of same date, to Heerbrand, thanking him for his book; (4) a like note to M. Crusius from same.

'In 1585, Socolovius published at Ingolstadt his rejoinder to their Preface, "*Ad Wittembergensium Invectivam quam Actis et Scriptis suis, &c., præfixerunt brevis Responsio.*"

'The original "Censura" was republished in 1584 at Paris (containing the Patriarch's first *Reply*), reprinted with Socoloff's matter, and notes by Feuardentius; with a sermon by Socoloff appended, "*Pro Cultu et Adoratione Jesu Christi in Eucharistiæ Sacramento.*"

'The conclusion of his *Third Reply*, in which he closes the correspondence (with the previous section about the Invocation of Saints, &c.), was also printed at Treves, 1586, entitled, "*Sententia Definitiva Jeremiæ Patr. Constant. de Doctrina et Religione Wirtembergensium Theologorum*" with "*Antidotus ultimæ Responsionis Eorundem*;" also Socoloff's "*Brevis Responsio*" of 1585.'

In acknowledging our great obligation to Dr. Gwynn for the foregoing most valuable information, as well as for one or two other references, I have to make a like acknowledgment for a couple of references of moment to Dr. Richard Gibbings, of Trinity College, for many years a successor to the Bishop in the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History, as also to Dr. Salmon, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.—J. Q.

INDEX.

[N.B.—Where the number of the volume is not given, the *first volume* is meant. The second volume is indicated by ii. The Arabic numerals indicate the pages. 'ff.' means 'and following pages.' 'N.T.' means 'New Testament.' 'O. T.' means 'Old Testament.' 'App.' means 'Appendix.' 'Lect.' means 'Lecture.']

ABBOTT, Archbishop, ii. 240, 250
Abelard, ii. 101
Accommodation, where allowable, 187
—, example of legitimate, 188
Acts of Apostles, 49 ff.
Acts of Paul and Thecla, 223
Adiaphoristic Controversy, ii. 209 ff.
'Admonitions, the Two,' ii. 231
Advantages of Historical Religion, 11
Aerius, 143
Agape, 71
Alasco, ii. 211
Alderman and Bishop in Saxon times, ii. 163
Aldrich, Dean, ii. 263–265
Alexander of Aboniteichos, 86
Alexandria, Church of, views of Theology in, 169
—, Patriarchs of, and Monks, ii. 99
Alexandrian MS., 140
— Booksellers, tricks and frauds of, 150
— Jews, 171
Alfred, King, ii. 157
Allegorical interpretation of Scripture, 171
Altar, Ignatius' view of, 194
—, *versus* Communion Table, ii. 264
Ambition of Roman Prelates, ii. 3, 6 ff.
Ammianus Marcellinus, quoted, ii. 20
Amour, William de St., ii. 86, 150, App. III. Vol. ii. 286 ff.
Anabaptists, ii. 192
Anacletus, Epistle of, in False Decretals, ii. 41, 42
'Anatomy of Antichrist,' by Huss, ii. 122
Anchorets, ii. 99
Andrews, Bishop, on Real Presence, ii. 270
Anglicanism, ii. 167, 204
—, Henry VIII.'s system of, ii. 204
Antichrist, ii. 104
—, whether Pope Antichrist, ii. 251
Antichristian spirit, ii. 219
Antinomianism of Early Protestants, ii. 192
Antioch, Fathers of School of, best expositors of Scripture, 20; Metropolis of Gentile Church, 106
—, traditional birthplace of St. Luke, 43
Antony, St., of Padua, ii. 78
Apocalypse, ii. 105
Apocryphal books cited by Clement of Alexandria, 152
Apollonius of Tyana, 86
Apologists, modern, 21
— early Christian, opinion as to second marriages, 33
—, Appeal of, to miracles, 57, 58

Apostles necessarily a limited order, 78, 80; ii. 33
— necessarily Bishops of Church where and while resident, 121, 122
—, College of, not centre of unity to Church, ii. 33
Apostolical Constitutions, 119, 142
— Fathers, Course II., Lect. II., 136 ff. (and see 'Fathers')
— Succession, ii. 255, 256, 261, 262
— Origin of Church of Rome, 251
— Institution of Episcopacy, ii. 255; age, writers of, in comparison with immediate successors, 136 ff.
— Sees, ii. 15
Apostolicity of Church, 212
Appeal to general feeling of Church implied by early Popes, ii. 11
Appeals, ii. 14, 17
— to Rome, ii. 20, 21 ff.
Appendix, ii. 271
Aquinas [*see* Thomas]
Archie Armstrong, before Star Chamber, ii. 244
Architecture, Ecclesiastical, significance of, ii. 220
Arians, 143; ii. 23
Aristotle, 44, 156
—, views of, as to Contemplative Intellect, 166
Arius, 143
Armagh, Richard of, ii. 150, 151, Appendix III. ii. 287 ff.
Arminians, ii. 223
—, tenets of, ii. 250
— and Laudians, ii. 262 ff.
Arminian divines, ii. 241
— and Calvinistic Controversy, ii. 251
Arminianism of Franciscans, ii. 93
— of James I., ii. 240
Arnauld, Jansenist, ii. 149
Arnold, Dr., views of Professor of History, 3
Arnold of Brescia, ii. 51, 101
Articles, source of Edward VI.'s, ii. 211 ff.
—, the Lambeth, ii. 229
Asceticism, rise of, Course II., Lect. VIII., 215 ff., 219
Asia Minor, prevalence of Greek in, 60
—, many dialects in, 60
Assembly of Westminster, 22
Athanasius, ii. 22, 23 ff., 74, 219
— cites Ignatius, 144
Athenian Assemblies, illustrating meetings of Early Church, 74 and Note
Athenagoras as to second marriages, 35
— on Celibacy, 224
Atonement, 190
Atterbury, ii. 175
Augustine, St., 203, 209; ii. 73, 74, 146
Augustinianism of Dominican Theology, ii. 93, 95, 96, 146
— of Wickliffe, Huss, Luther, and Jansenists, ii. 146
— opposed to Romish system, ii. 146, 147
Augsburg Confession, ii. 209, 211 ff.

BABYLONIAN Harlot, ii. 104
Bacon, Lord, ii. 56, 140, 194
Bacon, N., ii. 240
Baptism, miraculous gifts of Holy Ghost not through or in, 78
—, St. Augustine and infant, ii. 147, 148
—, Justin Martyr and, 175
Barnabas, 139
—, his (so-called) Epistle, 148 ff. Appendix I., ii. 272 ff.
Barnes, ii. 190, 207
Baronius, ii. 47, 202
Barons, English, and Wickliffism, ii. 154, 156
—, English, ii. 169, 235
Barrow, Dr., quoted, 206
—, as to unity of Church, ii. 34, 263
Basil, St., as to second marriages, 35
Bede, Venerable, ii. 148
Bedlam, shall we take saints from? ii. 80
'Behemoth,' Hobbes', ii. 238
Bellarmine, ii. 202
Bembus, ii. 186
Benedict, St., ii. 74
Benedictines, ii. 90
Benefices in England, ii. 165
Bentley, Dr., on Apostolic Constitutions, 119
—, 'Dissertation on Phalaris,' 150
—, ii. 232

Bernard, St., ii. 74, 101, 219
—, letter of, to Pope Eugenius, ii. 102
Billingsgate, Ecclesiastical, ii. 65
Bishop, an Apostle necessarily, of Church while resident, 121
—, 209, 211, ii. 12, 16, 17
Bishops, early Roman, Course III., Lect. III., ii. 3 ff.
— in Saxon times, ii. 163
—, Cyprian's view of, ii. 13
—, Melanchthon's view of, ii. 209
—, Luther's view of, ii. 209
Bohemia, ii. 168
Bonner, Bishop, ii. 166
Brachmans, ii. 99
Bradwardine, ii. 146, 148
Bridges, ii. 239
Bridget, St., of Sweden, ii. 78
Brissot, 26
British Church, ii. 43, 163 ff.
Bucer, Martin, ii. 215 ff.
—, influence of, over form of English Liturgy, ii. 216
'Bucerism,' ii. 216
Buddhism, catholicity of, 130; ii. 99
Bull, Bishop, his doctrine of Justification a paradox when first propounded, 27
—, 'Harmonia Apostolica' of, alarm produced by it, 28
—, Nelson's Life of, 28
Bull of Pope Benedict XI., ii. 84, 85
— of Pope Nicholas IV., ii. 89
Bullinger, ii. 211
Burke, Edmund, 25; ii. 29, 61
Burnet, Bishop, ii. 144
— MS. from Stillingfleet Collection, ii. 172
— on Bucer, ii. 216
Burton, Dr., mentioned, 53
Butler, Bishop, 'Analogy,' quoted, 8
— referred to, 27
Butler, Professor Archer, T.C.D., and Cardinal Newman, as to 'Development,' 91, 92
Byzantinism, ii. 167
Byzantium (see Constantinople)

Calvin, John, ii. 133, 149, 178, 211, 216
— on Baptism, ii. 148
— character of, ii. 223 ff., 226
Calvin, Theologic system of, ii. 225 ff.
Calvinism, ii. 262, 263
— doctrinal, in England, ii. 240
— of Dominicans, ii. 93
— of Jansenists, ii. 139
Calvinist Presbyterian on English throne, ii. 175
Calvinistic Controversy, ii. 251
Cambridge, Popish party at, ii. 216
Canon, of N.T., writings which form it best evidence of Apostles' teaching, 21
— of N.T. very early fixed, 118 119
— of N.T. cautiously fixed, 152
— of N.T., 147
Canon Law, ii. 41, 56, 84, 160
Canons, against marriages of priests and English clergy, ii. 164
Capito, ii. 192
Cardinals, election of Pope by, ii. 48
Caroline, Sister, ii. 82
Carthage, communication with Rome, 202 ff.
— Church of, superior to Rome in great writers, 208
— Appeal from Rome to, ii. 14
Cartwright, ii. 155, 231, 232, 233
Casaubon, on Epistle of Barnabas, 150
Castes, priestly, of Egypt and India, ii. 57
Catechetical School of Alexandria, 169
Catherine, St., of Sienna, ii. 78
Cathedrals, Architecture of, ii. 220
Catherine Cree, Laud at dedication of, ii. 242, 243, 263
Catholic, meaning of, 129 ff.
Catholicity, two senses of, 130, 131
— obscured by fixed local centre, 131
— wanting to Church of Rome, ii. 31
— wanting to Roman and Greek Churches, ii. 73
Cato of Utica, 153
Cautions, in use of Ecclesiastical History, 17, 23; ii. 6
— in use of Christian antiquity as witness to teaching of Church, 22, 23

Cautions in judging of opinion of age by leading writers, 23, 25 ff.
Cavaliers, ii. 246, 258
Celestinus, Pope, ii. 21
Celibacy, 221 ff.; ii. 49, 54, 56 ff.
— of clergy in England, ii. 164
Ceremonies, ii. 209, 231, 243
— of Investiture by Ring and Crozier, &c., ii. 55, 58
— Laud's, ii. 242, 243, 263
Ceres, legend and mysteries of, 179, 181, 183
—, priestesses of (Μέλισσαι), 184
Chalmers, Dr., story of, 30
Chapters, ii. 56
— English Cathedral, ii. 221
Charlemagne, conception of, of Empire, 236, 242
Charles I., King, ii. 217, 241, 243, 245, 246, 250, 251
—, Parliaments of, ii. 262
—, Divines of, ii. 263
Chaucer, 'Good Parson,' ii. 153
Children of Clergy, ii. 57
Chillingworth, and Knott, ii. 248, 249
Christian, word of Latin origin, 106
— misapprehension as to origin of, 106, 107
— use of, in N.T. proof of genuineness, 107
— use of, by Milman, ii. 68
Christianity, an Historical Religion, 9 ff., 15, 21
— and Sacerdotalism, 196
— connection of, with History favourable to civilisation, 12 ff.
— not a system of pure Reason, 166
— not a Religion of mystery, 188, 189
— difference between, and Jewish sects, 64
— Regenerating power of, 159
— not destruction of Roman Empire, ii. 3
Χρηματίζω, meaning of, 106, 107
Chronology, difficulty as to, in N.T., 51
Chrysostom, St., 184; ii. 21, 26
Church, St. Augustine's conception of, ii. 147
— conception of, constitutes unity of Christian History, 13
— meaning of, and what constitutes, 71 ff.
Church, Constitution of Early, 73
— Course I., Lect. IX., 118 ff.
— Christian, regenerating power, 159
— and State, not one society, 248
— and State, ii. 228
— relations of, to Judaism, Course I., Lect. VIII., 106 ff.
— stability of, whence derived, ii. 200 ff.
— Size of particular, ii. 28
—, Ancient, authority of, ii. 201 ff.
—, Wickliffe, &c.'s, views of, ii. 119
—, Visible, question of, ii. 251, 252
—, Definition of, in Edward VI.'s Articles, ii. 213
Church Government, origin of, 69
—, Bishop Horsley's hypothesis of, 70
—, only gradually evolved, 120
Chrysippus, 157
Cicero, on Mysteries, 180, 181
'Ciceronianus,' of Erasmus, ii. 181
Circumcision, and Samaritans, 76
— St. Paul's view of, 104, 105
Clarendon, Lord, account of Laud, ii. 244
Clarke, ii. 263
Clement, of Alexandria, as to second marriages, 35
—, 148, 152, 169
Clement, of Rome, 139
—, his writings, 140, 141
—, as to Priesthood, 194
Clementine Homilies, as to Petrine and Pauline Parties, 116
Clergy and Laity in Early Church, 123
Clergy and Laity, ii. 259, 260, 261
Clergy, English, ii. 164
'Clitopho,' ii. 194
Cobblers, not always best Preachers, ii. 80
Cobham, Lord, ii. 144, 158
Cochlæus, ii. 207
Colet, Dean, ii. 190
Collier's Ecclesiastical History, ii. 144
'Colloquies' of Erasmus, ii. 184
Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne, ii. 43
Common Law of England, Insular and Saxon character of, ii. 163
—, influence over position of Priesthood in England, ii. 165
'Common-places,' Melanchthon's, ii. 214, 222, 225

Commons of England, ii. 163, 164, 235, 236
—, and Charles I., ii. 245, 246
—, House of, and Pope, ii. 168 ff.
Communion, Holy, Justin Martyr as to, 175
—, Tertullian as to, ii. 260
Communion, Holy, 189, 190 ff.
Communion Tables, ii. 264 (see also Real Presence)
Concubinage, in English Church, ii. 164
—, and elsewhere, ii. 165
Conditions of Christian life, as viewed by Apostles, 66
Condorcet, mentioned as illustration, 26
Confession of Augsburg, ii. 209, 211 ff.
Constantine the Great, 237, 238; ii. 17, 35
—, whether originator of Metropolitans, ii. 13
Constantinople, ii. 24
—, claims of, *versus* Rome, ii. 71
—, Emperor of, ii. 167
Constitution of Apostolic Churches, Course I., Lect. IX., 118 ff.
'Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles,' 119, 142
Consubstantiation, ii. 207
Contemplation *versus* Action, ii. 112
Continental theories as to value of Ecclesiastical History, 5
—, answered, 6 ff.
Contracted forms of proper names, in connection with St. Luke, 44
Controversial Manuals no safe guides, 23
Controversy, spirit of, unfavourable to truth, 17, 33
Convocation, Houses of, in England, ii. 165, 175, 221
Convocation and Charles I., ii. 245
Cooper, ii. 239
Copleston, Bishop, 108
Corinth, Jewish element in Church of, 109, 110
Cornelius, Centurion, in Acts, 61, 67
Cornelius Scriblerus, cropped hair, and blue and buff, ii. 258
Cossa, Balthasar (see John XXIII.)
Council, General, objection to fixing Canon by, 124
— of Basle, ii. 151
— of Chalcedon, ii. 24
Council of Constance, ii. 114, 118, 148, 151
— of Elvira, ii. 62
— of Jerusalem (so-called), 102
—, Second Lateran, ii. 48
— of Nicæa, ii. 59
—, Quinisext, ii. 60
— of Sardica, ii. 23, 24 ff.
— of Trent, 22, 194; ii. 137, 146
— of Vienne, ii. 86
Councils, decrees of Early, showing prevalent opinion, 22
—, Gerson's view of, ii. 118
—, forbidding marriage of Clergy, ii. 63
—, General, ii. 17, 35, 36
'Councils, Age of,' ii. 113 ff.
Courtenay, Bishop of London, ii. 155
Coverdale, ii. 210
Cowling, Lord Cobham's seat, centre of Wickliffism, ii. 158
Craniologists, ii. 224
Cranmer, Archbishop, ii. 172, 173, 210, 211, 214, 215, 216, 229
—, on Real Presence, ii. 267
Cranmer, George, letter to Hooker, ii. 231, 252
Creeds, 120
—, primitive, doctrines of, witness to, in early anti-heretical writers, 21
—, independent witness to N.T., 21
—, secret mark, or token of Christians in primitive Church, 179
Crellius, Socinian writer, 143
Criticism, freaks of over-luxuriant, 85
—, historical, ii. 128
Critics, small Biblical, their tricks, 46
—, tests of, 52
Cromwell, Oliver, character of, ii. 7
—, mentioned, ii. 246
Cross, sign of, ii. 209
Crozier, ii. 54 ff., 58
Cudworth, ii. 263
Curate and Friar, ii. 165
Cureton, Mr., and Ignatian Epistles, 143 ff.
Cyprian, on Sacrifice, 197
—, History &c. of, 209, Course II., Lect. VII., 200 ff.; Course II., Lect. VIII., 216 ff.
—, on supremacy of Roman Church, 262 ff.

Cyprian, Mr. Shepherd's view of writings ascribed to, 201 ff.
—, views of Bishop held by, 212 ff.; ii. 17
— on Celibacy, 224–226
—, Appeal to, ii. 14, 15
—, ii. 219
Cyril, of Alexandria, ii. 21

D'AILLY, PETER, ii. 120–122
Damian, Peter, ii. 64, 65
Danish Bishops, ii. 256
D'Aubigné, Dr. Merle, ii. 143 ff.
Davenant, ii. 251
Decretal Epistles, ii. 227
'Decretals, False,' ii. 36 ff., 56, 164
— —, Causes which led to reception of, Course III., Lect. VI., ii. 41 ff.
Demiurgus, 184
Demonax, 182
Development, proper sense of, Course I., Lect. VII., 90 ff.
—, Cardinal Newman on, 91–93
—, in reception of Gentiles into Church, 94
—, could not arise from human reasoning, 96
Devil incarnate, ii. 117
'Dialogues on Affairs of Luther,' by Erasmus, ii. 187
'"Didache" of Twelve Apostles,' 119 (note)
Dioceses, English, ii. 221
Diognetus, Epistle to, quoted, 152
Dionysius, Bishop, account of St. Peter at Corinth, 115
—, fragment of Epistle, ii. 18
Disciplinarian disputes, ii. 252
'Discipline, The,' ii. 231
'Divine Faith,' dogma of Schoolmen, ii. 107, 111
'Divine Right of Episcopacy,' by Bishop Hall, ii. 256
Divine right of kings, ii. 172 ff.
Dobbin, Dr., attempt of, to prove date of Gospels, 107, 108
Dodwell, on feeling about celibacy
—, on Mysteries, 183
Dominic, St., ii. 74, 78, 86, 102
—, compared to Wesley, ii. 92 ff.
Dominicans and Franciscans, Course III., Lect. X., ii. 92 ff., 100, 88 ff., 102
Dominicans and Franciscans, and Council of Trent, ii. 146
Downham, ii. 251
Drunkard, ii. 193, 220
Dryden, as illustration of popular writer not necessarily representing permanent opinion, 28, 29; ii. 153
'Dunciad,' Pope's, 27
Durandus Mimatensis, ii. 86
Dutch Church, Remonstrants, ii. 262

EAST AND WEST, relation of, with regard to Christianity and Civilisation, 13, 14
Eastern and Western Churches, ii. 73, 166, 200
— — — Monks, ii. 98 ff.
Ebionites, 68, 111, 120
—, as to Petrine party, 116
Ecclesiastical History, value of it, 4
— —, uses of it, ii. 65
— —, compared with history of sciences, 4
— —, needful for a divine, 5
— —, not a mere instrument of controversy, 17
— —, cautions with reference to, 18, 23, 25 ff.
— —, a key to Scriptures, 19
— —, but may be abused in this regard, 19
— —, direct testimony of, to nature of Apostles' teaching, 21
— —, peculiarly adapted for philosophical treatment, 24
— —, no mere chronicle, 165
Ecclesiastical Courts and Law, English, ii. 221
— system of Henry VIII. and his politicians not a stable one, ii. 198
— Government, as stable basis of Church, ii. 200
Eckius, ii. 207
Edward III. and Pope, ii. 162, 163
Edward the Confessor, ii. 164, 165
Edward VI., ii. 208, 209, 215, 217
Edward VI.'s Articles, ii. 211 ff., 264 (note 6)
'Εκκλησία, meaning of, 72, 73, 74
Elders in primitive Church teachers as well as rulers, 125
Election to Church offices, ii. 56
Eleusis, Mysteries of, 181 ff.
Elizabeth, Queen, of England, ii.

168, 169, 171, 217, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 250, 252
Elizabethan theology, traditions of, ii. 251
Emperor Henry III., ii. 49
Emperors', German, ideal of universal sway, 249 (and see, Imperial)
—, position of Christian, in the Church, ii. 71
Empire, relations to Church and Papacy, 235 ff.; ii. 68 ff.
England, not patient under Romanism in mediæval times, ii. 160 ff.
— and Rome, ii. 163 ff.
—, Church of, true position of, ii. 204, 205
— —, debt to Erasmus, ii. 189
— — owes her position to appeal to Scripture, ii. 199
English writers, forgotten, 28
— people, temper of, as shown in Common Law, ii. 163
— Clergy, ii. 164, 165
— systematising genius, compared with French and German, ii. 224, 225
Enigmatical interpretation of Scriptures by the Fathers, 20
Epiphanius on Samaritans, 76
— on Ebionites, 111
Episcopacy, ii. 209
— in England, last blow to, under Charles I., ii. 245
—, view of, by leading Laudian divines under Charles I., ii. 251, 252 ff.
—, view of, by earlier divines, in England, ii 252, 253, 258, 259
—, Laud on, ii. 257 (and see Bishop)
Episcopius, ii. 262
Epitomes, 147
Erasmus, Course IV., Lect. IV., ii. 176 ff.
—, Stillingfleet on, ii. 176 ff.
— and Voltaire compared, ii. 179, 180
—, disinterested attachment of, to true religion, ii. 180
—, not to be accounted for by vanity, ii. 180
—, 'Ciceronianus' of, ii. 181
—, opposition to revived Paganism, ii. 182
—, timidity of, not cowardice, ii. 182, 183, 185
Erasmus, and Luther ii. 183 ff.
—, his notions of Reform, ii. 185
—, disposition of, contrasted with Luther's, ii. 185
—, what his life devoted to, ii. 185
—, his edition of N.T., ii. 186, 194, 195
—, his Reformation contrasted with Luther's, ii. 186, 187
—, fragment of account of his own position and plans, in 'Dialogues on Affairs of Luther,' ii. 187
—, influence of, on English Church, ii. 189
—, tribute of, to Archbishop Warham, ii. 189, 190
— and Socrates, and Bacon, ii. 194; Appendix VI., ii. 295 ff.
Erastianism, ii. 174
— of popular party in Queen Elizabeth's time, ii. 238
Ἑρμηνεύς, ἑρμηνευτής, ἑρμηνεία, meaning of, with reference to Papias' account of SS. Peter and Mark, 58
Essenes and Herodians, 64
Essene form of Eastern Monasticism, ii. 99
'"Et cætera" oath,' ii. 245
Ethelbert, King, ii. 157
Eucharist, 176 (see Communion)
Eusebius, of Cæsarea, estimate of Ignatius and Papias by, 138
—, allusion to Epistle of Trallesians, 145
—, panegyric of Constantine by, 238
Excommunication, ii. 11, 16, 17
Exo- and Eso-teric doctrine, 172, 173

FANATICISM, use of, in Church of Rome, Course III., Lect. IX., ii. 76 ff.
Fathers, the early, their works as evidence of genuineness and authenticity of N.T., 21
—, gaps in succession of their writings accounted for, 23
—, in Controversial Manuals, 23
— of one age, or one single Father, not necessarily representative of age, 25, 29
—, abuse of, in controversy, 33
— views of, on Simon Magus, 87

FATHERS

Fathers, Apostolical, Course II., Lect. II., 136 ff.
— excessive veneration for Apostolic Fathers an innovation, 137
—, great inferiority of their writings to those of Apostolic times, 136, 147, 148
—, their proper place, 137, 139
—, the, 178, 189, 196
—, their view of Celibacy and Virginity, 223 ff.; ii. 62
—, their view of post-Apostolic miracles, 229
—, their appeal to traditions of Apostolic Churches, 252
—, their view of mysteries, 183
—, Latin, revived by Erasmus, ii. 176
— as basis for authority of Church, ii. 201 ff.
— authority of, ii. 203
Felix, Governor of Judæa, and Simon Magus, 84
'Filioque' clause in Nicene Creed, ii. 201
Final Perseverance, ii. 240
Firmilian of Cæsarea, 9
Flogging of heretics by Sir Thomas More, ii. 191
Fontenelle, ii. 111
'Foundation' distinct from 'Government,' ii. 33, 34
Fox, Charles James, ii. 258
France, ii. 168
Francis, St., of Assisi, ii. 74, 88
— compared to Whitefield, ii. 92 ff.
Francis, St., ii. 103, 104, 149
Franciscans, ii. 88 ff., 103 ff., 149
— and Dominicans, Course III., Lect X., ii. 92 ff., 100
— Spiritual, ii. 104, 119
Frankfort, troubles at, ii. 210
Free-will, ii. 226, 240, 248
French Revolution, 26; ii. 191
— Church, ii. 200
— love of system, in Calvin, ii. 224
— Protestant Churches, Orders of, ii. 256
Friars, ii. 84 ff., 87 ff.; Course III., Lect. X., 92 ff., 149, 152, 176
— and regular Clergy in England, ii. 165 (and see Franciscans and Dominicans)

GNOSTIC

Frith, John, account of, ii. 195 ff., 190
— —, his dispute with his judges, ii. 196, 197, 198
Fry, Mrs., ii. 82
Fulke, ii. 253
Fuller, Church Historian, and Wickliffe, ii. 145

GALATIA, Churches of, 108
Gallican Church, ii. 200
Gardiner, Bishop, ii. 166
Gaps in Patristic Writers accounted for, 23
Gaunt, John of, ii. 154, 155
Geddes, Dr. M., on Council of Sardica, ii. 24
Geneva, source of Puritanism, ii. 210, 227
—, later Church of, ii. 226
Genevan Reformation, influence on English Reformation, ii. 221, 237
General Assembly, ii. 245
General Council (see Council)
Gerbert, ii. 151
German writers of history, the dangers of their method, 40
— critics, 55
— Pantheism, 165
— notion of Petrine and Pauline parties, 114 ff.
— love of system, ii. 224
— and Swiss Protestants, ii. 211
Germany, ii. 75
— influence of, on English Reformation, ii. 206 ff.
Gerson, ii. 118, 121, 122
Gift of Tongues, Neander's theory of, considered, 51 ff.
— —, as sign of universality of Gospel, 60, 61
Gifts, supernatural, Course I., Lect. VI., 75 ff.
— —, bestowed by imposition of Apostles' hands, 77 ff.
— —, not given in or through baptism alone, 78
— —, withdrawal of, facilitated and provided for, 78 ff., 122
— —, mythic, fancy will not explain, 80, 81
Gnosis of Clement of Alexandria, 170
Gnostic, system proof of impression of Christianity, 86
—, Simon Magus the first, 87

Gnosticism, 87, 120; ii. 100
— not properly a Christian heresy, 86
— knowledge of, necessary to understand St. John, 19
Gnostics, 160, 172, 222
— their teaching compared with modern attempts to separate Ideal and Historic Christ, 9 ff.
God's governance of affairs of world, 38, 39
Gospel, not recommended at first by meeting men's conscious wants, 10
Gratian, 'Decretum,' ii. 60
Greek Fathers, study of, useful to understand N.T., 201
— —, cautions in study of, 201
—, prevalence of, in Asia Minor, 60
— Church and Clergy, ii. 61, 63
— and Roman Churches, ii. 166
— Church and Lutherans, ii. 200; Appendix VII., ii. 297 ff.
— Church and James I., ii. 201
— philosophy, failure of, 155
— view of pure intellect, 166
— learning in West, ii. 176
— and Latin types of Christianity, ii. 68, 69, 72
Greeks and French, ii. 224
Gregory of Nyssa, 222
Gregory VII., Pope, ii. 49, 54 ff., 100, 102
Gregory the Great, ii. 74
Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln, ii. 164
Grotius, Hugo, ii. 262

HALL, Bishop, ii. 251, 256
Hammond's Commentary on N.T., illustrating abuse of Ecclesiastical History as a key to Scriptures, 19
Hampole, Richard Rolle, Hermit of, ii. 157
Hardouin, Father, 200, 205
'Head of the Church,' in England, ii. 171
Hebrew, Jewish prejudices with regard to, 60, 61
—, study of, in West, ii. 177
Hegelian divines of Germany, 166
Henry I., ii. 164
Henry IV., and Pope, ii. 163
Henry V., and Pope, ii. 162, 163
Henry VII., ii. 169, 171, 235

Henry VIII., ii. 162, 166, 169, 170, 171, 190, 195, 198, 200, 201, 204–207, 235, 236, 237
—, and Luther, ii. 208
Henry III., Emperor, ii. 47
Heretics, early writers against, 21
Hermas, 140
Herodians and Essenes, 64
Heylin, 'Life of Laud,' ii. 248–250, 256
High Churchmen, ii. 174, 175
— Commission, Court of, ii. 174
'High and Dry,' ii. 263
Hildebrand (see Gregory VII.).
Hippolytus (Philosophumena) and Simon Magus, 87, 160, 161; ii. 19
Historical nature of Christianity, 9
— lectures, what they should be, ii. 128
— evidence, the basis of Protestantism, ii. 205
History, Ecclesiastical (see Ecclesiastical)
—, Dr. Arnold's views on, 3
Hobbes, 'Leviathan,' 236; ii. 171, 69
Hohenstaufen, ii. 167
Holy Thorn, ii. 139
Homily 'On Salvation of Mankind,' 214
—, 'Of worthy receiving of the Sacrament,' with regard to Real Presence, ii. 269, 270
Honorius, Pope, ii. 27
Hooker, 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' on Unity of Church and State, 248
— on Episcopacy, ii. 253, 254–256
— on Clergy and Laity, ii. 260
— on Calvin, ii. 224, 227
— on Real Presence, ii. 267–269
Hooker, 107, 154, 193, 231, 233, 234, 238, 239
Hooper and Ridley, ii. 210
— and Calvin, 229
Horace, Satire 'Unde et quo Catius?' showing cultivation of memory among ancients, 48
Horsley, Bishop, hypothesis of origin of Church Government, 70
Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, ii. 25
Hug, with reference to Theophilus and St. Luke, 49

Hug, Acts of the Apostles, 53
Hume, ii. 50, 170
Hurd, Bishop, ii. 145
Huss, John, ii. 118 ff., 146, 148, 149; Appendix V., ii. 292 ff.

IGNATIUS, 139, 194, 223
—, his writings, 142 ff.
—, Long and short recension of Epistles of, 143
Immaculate Conception of B. Virgin Mary, ii. 88, 93, 94, 146
Immediate successors of the Apostles, references to their testimony of nature of Apostolic teaching, in early Fathers, 21
Imperial supremacy, course of theory of, 242, 243
— power *versus* Papal, ii. 46, 54
Imposition of hands, of Apostles, rather than Baptism, connected with miraculous gifts, 78 ff., 124, 230
Inartificiality of N.T. Writers, 52, 53
Independents, ii. 246, 262
Infidel movements, ii. 138
Infidelity and Protestantism, ii. 139, 140 ff.
— of later Genevan Church, ii. 226
Innocent III., rescript to Bishop of Exeter, ii. 164
Innocent IV. and the Friars, ii. 84
Inspiration, hypothesis of continuous, in the Church, 15
'Institutes,' Calvin's, ii. 223, 225
Investiture, ii. 49, 54, 56, 58
Irenæus, Neander's citation of, as to Gift of Tongues, 55
— latest Author who mentions Gift of Tongues as existing in his time, 57
— on Miracles of Tongues, 230
— on Gift of Tongues as attesting Universality of Gospel, 60
— on Sacrifice, 197
— on Bishops, 209, 210
— appeal to testimony of Church of Rome, 252, 253
— meaning of disputed passage in, 254 ff.
— opposed to Victor of Rome, ii. 9
Irish Church, ii. 43
Irvingites, compared to Montanists, 35, 57
— and Gifts of Tongues, 57
Italian Princes and Popes, ii. 46–48

JAMES, ST., and Council of Jerusalem (so-called) as to Gentiles, 103
— alone of Apostles, had local See, 121
— whether an Apostle, 121
James I., King of England, ii. 229, 230, 235, 239, 250
— and Greek Church, ii. 201
— character of, ii. 239, 240
James II., King, ii. 174
Jansenists, ii. 93, 138, 139, 146
Jeremiah, Greek Patriarch, ii. 200, Appendix VII., ii. 297 ff.
Jerome, St., Commentary on Isaiah with reference to Millennium, 31
— on Asceticism, 222, 223; ii. 73
Jerusalem, rapid increase of primitive Christian community at, 70
—, primitive Christian community at, formed one *Church*, but not one *Congregation*, 71
— destruction of, close of Apostolic period, 129
— reasons for destruction of, 132; ii. 33
— influence of (and dangers of it), as local centre of Church, 132
— Church of, ii. 18
— Church of, not centre of Unity, ii. 31 ff.
Jesuits, ii. 96, 97, 138
Jewell, Bishop, ii. 253
Jewish prejudices as to Hebrew being the only clean language, 60, 61
— Law, institutions of, only gradually superseded by Christianity, 63, 64
— sects, difference between, and Christians, 64, 69
— conceptions and usages, how treated by the Apostles, 189
— views of Christianity, ii. 32
Jews and Samaritans, 77
— and Gentiles in Primitive Church, 101, 102
Johanna Southcote, let us erect statues to, ii. 79
John, St., date of death of, 42, 43
John XXIII., Pope, ii. 115
Johnson, Dr. S., 12, 94; ii. 81, 82, 145

Josephus and Simon Magus, 85
Judaism, earliest relations of Christian Church to, Course I., Lect. V., 63 ff., 106
Judaisers, in Colossian, Corinthian, Ephesian, Galatian, and Roman Churches, 108, 109 ff.
Judaising tendency at height at time of destruction of Jerusalem, 132
Justification by faith, Luther and, ii. 186
— —, in Homilies, ii. 214, 240
Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, and doctrine of Millennium, 32
— and Simon Magus, 85
— account of, 161 ff.
— as to Trinity, 166, 167, 168
— as to early Christian rites, 175
— as to Reserve, 177
— as to Sacrifice, 195
— on Asceticism, 159, 160, 223
Justinian, Emperor, his conception of Empire, 236, 240
Juxon, Bishop of London, ii. 244

KANT, ii. 109
Keble, on Hooker, as to Real Presence, ii. 267, 268
Keys of Heaven, ii. 43, 46
King and Pope, ii. 168 ff.
— and Church, in England, ii. 170 ff.
Knott, the Jesuit, ii. 247 (note 1), 248 ff.
Knox, John, ii. 231
Knyghton, Roman Catholic writer, as to Lollards, ii. 158
Kuinoel, 'Prolegomena to Acts of Apostles' by, 53
— reference to, in quotation from Milman, 104

LACHMANN'S reading of 1 Cor. viii. 7, 110
Lainez, ii. 138
Laity and Clergy in early Church, 123
Laity and Clergy in Church, ii. 259, 260
Lambeth Articles, ii. 229
Lancaster, Duke of, and Wickliffites, ii. 155
Lateran Council, Second, ii. 48
Lathbury, Mr., his 'History of the Non-jurors,' ii. 200
Latimer, Bishop, ii. 229
Latin Christianity, inconsistent with progress, ii. 75
'Latitude men,' ii. 263
Laud, Archbishop, ii. 217, 241 ff.
—, his ceremonies, ii. 242, 243
—, his character by Clarendon, ii. 244
—, his treatment of the Scottish Church, ii. 245
—, tendency to counter-Reformation, Course IV., Lect. IX., ii. 247 ff.
—, offered a Cardinal's hat, ii. 249, 250
—, his position with regard to prevalent opinions of his time, ii. 251
— and Hall, ii. 256
—, his remarks on Hall's book, ii. 257
—, his 'thorough,' ii. 243, 256
—, sincerity and character, ii. 242 ff.
Laudian divines, teaching of, ii. 250 ff.
— — and Hooker, ii. 254
— — and Theology, Course IV., Lect. X., ii. 258
— party, its Romanistic tendency, ii. 262
— — split into two, ii. 262, 263
Lectures, what they should be, ii. 128
Leicester, Earl of, ii. 155
Leo X., Pope, ii. 181, 186
Liberius, Bishop of Rome, ii. 27
Limborch, ii. 262
'Lions,' in Mithraic Mysteries, 184
Liturgies, in Early Church show prevalent opinions, 22
Liturgy, English, ii. 216, 221
Livy, ii. 200
Lobeck, 43
Local centre of Church, ii. 44
'Loci Communes,' Melanchthon's, ii. 214, 222, 225
Locke, ii. 109
Logic, ii. 109, 110
Logos, 167
Lollards, ii. 143, 157, 158, 168 (and see Wickliffe)
Long Parliament, 22; ii. 245
Louis XIV., ii. 200

Low Church party in England, ii. 175
Loyola, Ignatius, ii. 82, 33, 133, 138
Lucian, quoted, 44
—, his 'Pseudo-mantis,' 158
Luke, St., 43, 44
— question of identity with Silas, and his name, 45
Luther, ii. 131, 132, 146, 177, 178, 197, 211, 223, 227
— and English Reformation, ii. 206 ff., 215
—, Lutherans, and Erasmus, ii. 183 ff.
Luther's Reformation, rising-point of, ii. 186
Lutheranism, ii. 218
— and Jansenism, ii. 138, 139
Lutheran Church, disputes in, ii. 209
Lutherans and Greek Church, ii. 200, Appendix VII., ii. 297 ff.
Lutterworth (see Wickliffe)
Lycaonians and St. Paul, with reference to Gift of Tongues, 59

Macaulay, Lord, ii. 76, 82 ff., 134, 141
Magistrates, Calvin's view of, ii. 228
Maimbourg's 'History of Schism of West,' a libel on Jansenists, 91
Mainwaring, ii. 241
Maitland, Dr., 'Church in the Catacombs,' referred to, 174
Malthusian spirit of critics, 44, 84
Manichæans, 222
Manichæism charged against Dominicans, ii. 88
Marcion, ii. 16
Mark, St., and St. Peter, 58, 59
— and Mark, Bishop of Alexandria, 149
Marriage of Clergy, ii. 56 ff.
— — progress of opinion in regard to, ii. 59
Martyr, Justin (see Justin)
Martyr, Peter, ii. 215, 216
Martyr, Bishops of early Roman Church too leniently judged, ii. 6
Martyrologies, Greek and Roman, nonsense of, 88, 89
Martyrs of Reformation in England, ii. 198
Mary, B. Virgin, ii. 84, 88, 93, 94, 146
Mary I., Queen of England, ii. 166, 210
Mason, F., 256
Mede, Joseph, ii. 251
Mediævalism, revivals of, 158, 159
Melanchthon, ii. 184, 206, 207, 209, 210, 214, 215, 216, 222–225, 229
— and Erasmus, ii. 183
Melanchthon's influence on the English Reformation, ii. 211
Melchizedek, ii. 259
Μέλισσαι, 184
Memory, cultivation of, amongst the Ancients, 48
Mendicant Orders, ii. 87, 149 (see Friars, Franciscans, Dominicans)
Metaphysics and Theology, ii. 226
Metropolitan jurisdiction in Church, origin of, ii. 13 ff.
Millennium, 31 ff.
Milman, Dean, 103; ii. 74
— as to Presbyters, 104
— caution as to erroneous view which might be suggested by, 104
— on Justinian, 240
— on German Emperors, 249, 250
— on False Decretals, ii. 37
— on Papacy, as revival of Empire of West, ii. 67–69
— on Pope John XXIII., ii. 116, 117
— on Huss, ii. 120
Milton, 29; ii. 226
Minucius Felix, on second marriages, 35
Miracles, post-Apostolical, 227 ff.
—, Apostolical, 229
Miraculous powers, intimations of transitory nature of, 78, 122, 123
— institutions of Apostolic Churches, 122, 123
— power in Priesthood, on the Sacramental theory, ii. 261
Mitford's 'History of Greece,' a satire on the Whigs, 91
Mithraic Mysteries, 184
Mithridates, case of, showing multiplicity of languages in Asia Minor, 60
Mode of treatment suitable to Prelections of a Professor, 38, 42
Mohammedanism, 33
—, catholicity of, 130
—, barriers to universality of, 131
Monastic Orders, attacks of Erasmus on, ii. 180

Monasticism, Eastern and Western, Course III., Lecture XI., ii. 98 ff.
Monks, ii. 81, 98 ff.
Montague, ii. 241
Montanism, 34, 35, 36
— compared to Irvingism, 35, 57
— and Gift of Tongues, 57
— compared to Friars, ii. 105
Moral and demonstrative certainty, ii. 106, 107 ff.
— state of Church at height of Papacy, ii. 114
More, Sir Thomas, ii. 190, 191
—, defence of himself as a persecutor, ii. 192
— and Frith, ii. 196
More, ii. 263
Mortmain Act, ii. 161
Morton, Bishop, his joke, ii. 250
Morton, Lord, and Knox, ii. 155
Mosaic Law, institutions of and Christianity, 64-66, 98, 99
—, view of the Apostles with regard to, at first imperfect, 67
— , causes of this imperfection, 67, 68
—, charge against St. Stephen with regard to, 68
Mosheim, ii. 122
—, on Church Constitution, 73
—, 'Dissertation on Ecclesiastical History,' and Simon Magus, 85
— on Ignatian Epistles, 143
— on Friars, ii. 103
— on Huss, ii. 120
Movement parties, often, rather than individuals, leaders of their time, 23
Murray, Dr., and 'Irish Miscellany,' 191, 192
Mysteries, Pagan, 174 ff., 177 ff., 179 ff.
—, allusions to, in N.T. writers, 188
Mystics, ii. 107 ff.
Mythic theory of origin of Christian History will not hold as to miraculous gifts, 80, 81
Mythic, Simon Magus not purely so, 87

NAMES AND USAGES, influence of associations of, ii. 219
Napoleon I., ii. 51
National Church, ii. 168, 217
Neander, theory of Gift of Tongues, 51 ff. 82, 83, 84
—, as to *Χαρίσματα* in general, 123
—, as to 1 Cor. vii. 14, 112
—, as to position of St. James, 122
—, as to Clergy and Laity, 123
—, citations of Tertullian and Irenæus, 55-57
Neri, Philip, ii. 133
Newman, Cardinal, his dialectic method criticised, 92, 93
—, on ecclesiastical miracles, 231
—, on the Pope, 244 ff.
Nicolas II., Pope, ii. 48
Nicolas IV., Pope, ii. 89
Nonconformists, ii. 149, 174
--, Queen Elizabeth's treatment of, ii. 239
Nonjurors, ii. 200, 219
Normans, in Italy, ii. 48, 49
Nuns, 226

OBSCURE atheistic writers, names of, preserved by Christian apologists, 27
Obscurity of interval immediately succeeding the Apostles' time, 133, 134 ff
Oecolampadius, ii. 197
Oliva, Peter, ii. 103-105, Appendix II., 281 ff.
Opera operata, ii. 243
Ophites, 181
Origen, 172, 181
—, on second marriages, 35
—, view of philosophy of Christianity, 170
Origin of reports of speeches in N.T., especially in Acts of the Apostles, 47, 48
Otho the Great, ii. 58

PAGAN element of Roman Catholicism, ii. 135 ff., 142
— revival, ii. 181
— prejudice, concessions to, 187
— religion, primitive form of, 180
— origin of Metropolitans, ii. 13
Pagi, Father, quoted, 151, 152
Paley, Archdeacon, 'Horæ Paulinæ,' 46, 53
Pantænus, founder of Alexandrian Catechetical School, 169

Pantheism, modern German, 165
Papacy, rise of, Course III., Lecture I., 235 ff.
—, relation of, to empire, 235 ff.; ii. 46, 69
—, foundations of, 251
—, necessary to stability of the Romish system, as centre of unity, ii. 166
Papal infallibility, 244
— corruptions, inherent vitality of, ii. 219
Paphnutius, ii. 59
Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, 59, 138
Parliament, English, Acts of, Anti-papal character of, ii. 161
— in Church matters *versus* the Crown, ii. 241
—, Charles I. and the, ii. 245
Parochial Clergy, and Monks, ii. 98 ff., 100
Parr, Dr., on Ignatian Epistles, 143
Parr, biographer of Ussher, ii. 264
Pascal, ii. 179
Patrimony of St. Peter, ii. 20
Patriotic party, in Queen Elizabeth's time, allied with Puritans, ii. 138
—, Erastianism of, ii. 138
Patriots, in Charles I.'s time, ii. 246
Paul, St., 45, 47
—, his mission to the Gentiles, 95, 96
—, his visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, 96, 97, 98, 99
—, his second visit to Jerusalem, 100
—, independent of other Apostles, ii. 33
Pearson, Bishop, 'Annales Paulinæ,' and 'Lectures on Acts,' 53
—, his 'Vindiciæ Ignatianæ,' 142
Pelagianism, charged against Franciscans, ii. 88
Penal laws, and Charles I., ii. 241
Pentateuch, Samaritan, 88
Pentecost, Effusion of Holy Spirit on day of, 54
Percy, Lord, and Wickliffe, ii. 154, 155
'Père Tout-à-tout,' of Voltaire, ii. 138
Persecution, Erasmus' views of, ii. 188
—, Sir Thomas More's spirit of, ii. 191, 192
Persecution of Williams by Laud, ii. 244
Persecutions, 160
Petavius, ii. 202
Peter, St., doctrine of, as to Mosaic Law, 65, 66
— — and Cornelius, 67
— — and Simon Magus, 83
— — and Gentiles, 94, 95
— —, supremacy of, among the Apostles, 263; ii. 71
— —, as head of Church, 213 ii. 71
— — and Keys of Heaven, ii. 43, 45
Peter Martyr, ii. 215, 216
Petrine and Pauline parties, 114 ff.
Philo, as to Logos, 167
—, allegorical interpretation of O.T., 171
Philosophical treatment peculiarly advisable in Ecclesiastical History, 24
— —, dangers of it, 40, 41
— —, right, what it is, 165
Philosophy, Greek, no regenerating power in, 155
—, Clement of Alexandria's views of, 169
—, Greek 166, 167
—, modern, views of Christianity, 168, 169
Photius, ii. 201
—, language of, with regard to early Fathers, 138
Physicians, among ancients, not always slaves, 43, 44
Planting and early training of Church, history of, 42 ff.
Plato, 156
Political reformation of religion by Henry VIII., ii. 198, 200, 205
Polycarp, 194
Pope, supremacy of, 206 ff., 213; ii. 69 ff.;— —, a doctrine, ii. 166
—, influence and power of, in England in Middle Ages, ii. 161 ff.
—, his recruiting depôt, ii. 263
—, Gerson's view of, ii. 118, 119
—, and English kings, ii. 169 ff. 236, 237
— Alexander IV., ii. 84
— Benedict XI., ii. 84, 85
— Boniface VIII., ii. 84, 85
— Clement V., ii. 85
— Cornelius, 208
— Eugenius III. and St. Bernard, ii. 102

Pope Gregory the Great, ii. 74
— Gregory VII., ii. 49 ff. Course III., Lect. VII., ii. 54 ff., 100, 102
— Innocent III., ii. 164
— Innocent IV., ii. 84
— John XXII., ii. 89–90
— John XXIII., ii. 115, 116
— Leo III., ii. 50
— Leo IX., ii. 49
— Leo X., ii. 181
— Martin IV., ii. 84
— Nicolas II., ii. 48
— Nicolas IV., ii. 89, 90
— Victor and Irenæus, ii. 8–9
— Victor II., ii. 47, 48
— Zachary, ii. 50
— Stephen, and Cyprian, 207; ii. 9 ff.
— Stephen, and Spanish Bishops, ii. 14
Popes, few great theologians among, 244
— corrupt, causes of their succession, ii. 46, 47
— and False Decretals, ii. 40
Popish plot, and Laud, ii. 241
Potter, Dr., answer of the Jesuit 'Knott,' ii. 248
'Prædicatio Petri,' as to Petrine party, 116, 117
Præmunire, Acts of, ii. 161
Predestination, ii. 88, 93, 96, 226
Predisposing causes of Reformation in England, Course IV., Lect. III., ii. 160
Presbyterianism, ii. 238, 246, 253
—, its founder, 144
—, Calvinistic and Scottish, ii. 228–230
—, Hooker on, 257
Presbyterians, 143
Prevalent state of opinion in age, how far proof of traditional opinion of Apostolic times, 22
Priesthood, 191, 192, 194
Private judgment, as applicable to Bible as to Fathers, 16
Probable evidence, ii. 106, 107
Prophesying, meaning of, in N.T., 61, 62
Proselytes, 103, 104; ii. 32
—, doctrines of Rabbis as to, 112
Protestantism and Romanism, ii. 80, 134
Protestantism based on historical evidence, not on mere authority, ii. 205
Protestantism, German, influence of, on English Reformation, Course IV., Lect. VI., ii. 206 ff.
Protestants and fanatics, ii. 78
Protestant sects and Monasticism, ii. 101
— views of Theology, ii. 107, 112
Puritans, ii. 210, 236, 237, 238, 239, 251
— Hooker's opponents, ii. 227, 253
— and Laud, ii. 241, 246
—, address of, to James I., ii. 239
Pythagoras, 156

Quacks, Simon Magus' time an age of, 85
Quakers, ii. 83
Quinisext Council, ii. 60
Quixote, Don, ii. 131

Ranke, ii. 76
Reaction to Romanism in England under Mary I., cause of, ii. 166
—, under Charles I. through Laud, Course IV., Lect. IX., ii. 247 ff.
—, extreme against Romanism, ii. 210
— under Stuarts, ii. 217
Real Presence, ii. 264 ff.
Realists and Nominalists, ii. 122
'Recognitions' of Clement, 149
Red plush breeches, ii. 145, 146
Reformation, circumstances of time necessary to movements of, ii. 131 ff.
Reformation, the English, Course IV., Lect. I., &c., ii. 127 ff
— —, internal origin and character of, ii. 135
— —, compared with Swiss and German Reformations, ii. 129
— —, predisposing causes of, ii. 160 ff.
Reformation, Counter, ii. 133
—, Counter, of Charles I.'s time, ii. 247 ff.
—, History of, in Henry VIII.'s time, what it properly is, ii. 195
—, Political, of Henry VIII., ii. 198, 200, 205.
—, of Luther contrasted with that of Erasmus, ii. 186, 187
—, dangers of, ii. 192
—, in Germany, ii. 75

Reformation, German, influence of, on English Reformation, ii. 168
—, French, ii. 168
—, Swiss, ii. 168
— of morals, need of, felt after excesses of pre-Flavian Roman Emperors, 153, 154
—, attempts at, through Pagan philosophy, 155, 157
— in Roman Church, ii. 47, 49, 62, 113, 118, 137, 138
Reforming monastic movements, ii. 100, 101
Reforming monastic spirit opposed to Papacy, ii. 101
Regeneration, 79
Religion, danger of separating it from History, 14
Religious and moral progress, not uniform, ii. 129 ff.
Remonstrants, ii. 262
Reserve, doctrine of, 172
Reuchlin, ii. 177
Revival of letters, Course IV., Lect. IV., 176 ff., 168
Revolution, French, 26; ii. 137; 191
Richard of Armagh, ii. 150, 151; Appendix III., ii. 287 ff.
Richard II., King, and Pope, ii. 162
Ridley, ii. 210, 229
Rienzi, ii. 51
Ring, Episcopal, ii. 54
Rites and ceremonies, ii. 209, 210
Rome, Primitive Church of, long destitute of miraculous gifts because unvisited by an Apostle, 80
—, primitive Church of, case of, with reference to Gentiles and Jews, 108, 109
—, Church of, inferior to African Church in great writers, 208
—, Church of, present state and danger of, ii. 141
—, Church of, essentially National and un-Catholic, ii. 30
—, Church of, supremacy of, 206, 207
—, appeals to, 207
— the centre of union for Europe, ii. 52, 70
— the great Apostolic See of West, ii. 70 ff.
— and Constantinople, ii. 71 ff.
—, notion of necessity of union with, ii. 45
Roman Bishops, advantages of, Course III., Lect. IV., ii. 16 ff, 44, 45
Roman genius revived in Church, ii. 5
Roman decadence not result of Christianity, ii. 3, 4
Roman Empire, traditions of, as factor in rise of Papal power, ii. 50 ff.
Roman Catholics, Ecclesiastical History necessary to refute, 16
Roman Catholic religion only suited to Latin type, 131
Roman Catholic views of Sacrament of Lord's Supper, 191–193
Romans, Epistle to, as to Jew and Gentile, 109 ff.
Romans, morals of ancient, 154
Romanism a blending of Christianity and Paganism, ii. 135
Romanism, seeds of decay in, ii. 136
— of Charles I., ii. 241
Romanistic temper, ii. 147
— tendency of Laudian party, ii. 262
Roper, Sir Thomas More's son-in-law, ii. 191
Rosinus, ii. 178; Appendix VI., ii. 295 ff.
Roundheads, ii. 258
Rousseau, J. J., 26
Rule of Faith, ii. 107
Russian Empire, 236
— Czar, representative of Cæsars, ii. 72

SACRAMENTS, 183, 186 ff., 189; ii. 212, 213
—, Dominican and Roman view of, ii. 95, 96
—, Franciscan view of, ii. 96
—, view of, of Laudian divines, ii. 251, 252
Sacramental system, Laudian, ii. 258 ff.
—view of Church rites, ii. 261 (and see Baptism, Communion)
Sacrifice, 190, 191, 193 ff.
Sacrilege and extortion under Queen Elizabeth, ii. 237
Sadducees, St. Paul not referring to, in 1 Cor. xv., 113
Sadolet, ii. 186
'Sæculum Synodale,' Course III., Lect. XIII., ii. 113 ff.

Saint, Mediæval, qualifications of, ii. 65
Samaritan, Justin Martyr a, 161
— family flayed alive, 89
— woman, legend of, 88, 89
Samaritans, conversion of, a step in the development of the Church, 75 ff.
— our Lord and, 75, 76
— and Simon Magus, 88
Sanderson, Bishop, ii. 230, 231
Saravia, ii. 239
Sardica, council of, ii. 23, 24
Saxon character of English law, ii. 163
— Church, ii. 164
Scantiness of information regarding period next after Apostles, Course II., Lect. I., 129 ff.
Scholastic Divinity, 165
— —, attack of Erasmus upon, ii. 180
Schoolmen, the, Course III., Lect. XII., ii. 106 ff.
— —, ii. 182, 226, 227
Schools, the, ii. 194
Scottish Reformers, ii. 219, 231, 237
— Church, Laud's treatment of, ii. 245
Scotus, Duns, ii. 222
Scripture, appeal to, by Church of England, ii. 199
Secrecy as to Christian rites in early Church, Course II., Lect. V., 174 ff.
Secular Clergy, ii. 81
Seed, ii. 263
Selina, St., ii. 82
Septuagint, 148 (note 8)
—, use of ἐκκλησία in, 73
Servetus, ii. 228
Severus, citation of Ignatius, 143
Shame, sense of, confounded with sense of guilt, 221
Sharpe, ii. 263
Shepherd, Mr., his 'History of Church of Rome,' as to Cyprian, 200 ff.
Sherlock, ii. 263
Signality of Gift of Tongues, 60
Silas, Silvanus, and Luke, Lucanus, 44, 45
Simon Magus, 77, 83
—, account of, 84 ff.
—, first Gnostic, 87
—, in Hammond's Commentary, 19
Simon Magus not purely mythic, 87
Simony, ii. 58 ff.
Socinians, 16, 143, 164, 190
Socrates, 156, 168, 182; ii. 194
Soofeeism, ii. 99
Spalatinus, Appendix IV., ii. 266
Speculative Theology, Course II., Lect. IV., 165 ff.
Spiritual Gifts, by imposition of hands of Apostles, 62
—, withdrawal of, 78, 122
—, Neander's view of, 123
Spiritualism, modern, 227, 228
Spurious names, how attributed to ancient authors, 142
State and Church, ii. 228
Stations, 36
Statute Books, English, evidence of unquietness of England under Papal government, ii. 161
Stephen, St., case of, with regard to Mosaic law, 68
Stephen, Pope, 207, ii. 9, 14
Stewart, Dugald, ii. 191
Stillingfleet, Bishop, on Eph. iv. 11–16, 122
— — on Friars, ii. 82, 103
— —, anecdote of Loyola, ii. 82, 83
— —, collection of MSS., ii. 108
— — on Erasmus, ii. 176
— —, ii. 149, 172
Stobæus, as to celibacy and marriage, 111, 112
'Stromata,' 169
Strype, ii. 210
Stuart dynasty, reaction under, ii. 217
Sudbury, Archbishop, ii. 155
Supremacy, Royal, Course IV., Lect. VIII., ii. 235 ff.
Surplice, ii. 209
Sutcliffe, ii. 239
Swiss Protestants, ii. 211, 217
Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais, 16, 17
Synods, Provincial, ii. 62, 63
Syriac version of Ignatian Epistles, 143, 144
System, Calvin's, ii. 224, 225 ff.

TAYLOR, JEREMY, on Real Presence, ii. 265, 266
Templars, ii. 86
Temporal and spiritual powers, struggle of, in England, ii. 168

Tertullian on second marriages, 34
— on Montanism, 36
—, Neander's appeal to, as to Tongues, 55
—, as to Trinity, 173
— compared with Cyprian, 210
—, 'De Virginibus velandis,' of Virgins, 225
— on Apostolic Churches and Church of Rome, 260, 261
— as to Clergy and Laity, ii. 259, 260
Thaumaturgists, the Apostles not, 86
Theocratic idea of government, 237
Theodoret, 184
'Theologia pectoris,' of Luther, ii. 186
Theology as a science, ii. 105 ff.
Theophilus, St. Luke's, whether historical, 48, 49
— —, resident at Rome, 49
Theophilus of Alexandria, ii. 21
Theresa, St., statue in St. Peter's, Rome, ii. 79, 80
— compared with Johanna Southcote, ii. 79, 80
Thomas Aquinas, ii. 95, 107, 222
'Thorough,' of Laud, ii. 243, 256
'Three Chapters,' ii. 27
Tillotson, ii. 263
Tithes, in England, 165
Todd, Dr., of T.C.D., ii. 143
Tongues, gift of, Neander's view of, 51 ff.
—, significant of universality of Gospel, 60, 61
— peculiarly suitable as gifts on baptism in Early Church, 62
Tonstal, Bishop, ii. 190
Tractarian movement, 15; ii. 133
— party, ii. 263
'Tract 90,' ii. 93, 146
Tradition, Apostolical, 16
— of Apostolic teaching in Fathers, 20, 21
— of Apostolic Churches, ii. 70
— of St. Mark, as disciple of St. Peter, as used by Neander, 58
— oral, 192, 193
Tradition, 209 ff.
— of old British and Irish Churches, ii. 43
Transition period from Apostolic times to middle of second century, obscurity of, 133
Translations of Bible in England, ii. 157
Transubstantiation, 184, 198, Course II., Lect. VI., 186 ff.; ii. 139, 196, 201
Travers, ii. 231
Trent, Council of, ii. 137
Trinitarian controversies, 165
Trinity, doctrine of, in Justin Martyr, 163, 164, 166, 167
Truth, love of, not in Schoolmen, ii. 109
—, measure of, ii. 193
Tübingen School, as to Petrine and Pauline parties, 114 ff.
Tudor dynasty, ii. 169 ff.
'Two Ways,' 148
Tyndale, William, ii. 190, 195, 206

UNIFORMITY of system of belief and practice in second century could not arise in obscurity, 133
Union between extreme Churches through the English Church, ii. 204
Unity of Christian History in conception of Church, 13
— of Church, theories of, and unity of Church and State, 247 ff.
— of Church, Course III., Lect. V., ii. 28 ff., 31 ff.
—, no one Patriarch centre of, in Greek Church, ii. 166
Universities, Protestant, treat students as sensible creatures, 53
Ussher, ii. 251
'Utopia,' Sir Thomas More's, ii. 191

VALENTINIANS, 256
Value of Antiquity, right, 91
Various readings, 141
Vestments, ii. 209, 210, 231
Victor, Bishop of Rome, ii. 8
Victor II., Pope, ii. 47, 48
Vigilius, ii. 27
Vineis, Peter de, on Monks, ii. 83
Virginity, St. Paul's view of, 222
—, early Fathers' view of, 223
Virgins, order of, 224
Visible Church, question of, ii. 251, 252
— — — lies at bottom of Roman *versus* Protestant controversy, ii. 252

Voltaire, ii. 138
— mentioned as illustration, 26
— and Erasmus, ii. 179
Vossius, Isaac, 142
Vulgar taste of Laud, ii. 242
Vulgate, ii. 73
—, Wickliffe's translation of Bible from, ii. 158

WANTS and wishes no test of religious truth, 6, 7, 8
Warburton, Bishop, introduction to 'Julian,' as to immediate successors of Apostles, 136, 137
—, 'Divine Legation,' as to Mysteries, 181, 182
—, 'Alliance,' 248
Warham, William, Archbishop, ii. 189, 190
Water in Eucharistic Cup, 197
Waterland, ii. 263
Wat Tyler, ii. 156
Wesley, John, ii. 82, 83, 92
West and East, 13, 14
Western and Eastern, Patriarchs and Churches, ii. 73, 166, 200
— — Monks, ii. 98 ff.
Westminster, Assembly of, 22
Wetstein's opinion on Syriac Epistle of Clement, 141
Whately, Archbishop, on use of term 'Christian' in N.T., 107
— — mentioned, 108
— —, 'Historic Doubts' &c., by, 202
— — on Kingdom of Christ, 248
Whig image of Constitution, ii. 170
— party, ii. 175
Whigs, satirised by Mitford, 91
—, and blue and buff, ii. 258
Whitby, Synod of, ii. 43
Whitefield, ii. 92, 133
Whitgift, Archbishop, ii. 146, 229, 232 ff., 239, 240
Wickliffe, Course IV., Lect. II., ii. 143 ff.
—, D'Aubigné on, ii. 144
Wickliffe, Fuller on, ii. 145
—, Augustinianism of, ii. 148
—, his views on Church property, ii. 152 ff.
—, Rector of Lutterworth, ii. 153
—, his petition to House of Commons, ii. 157
—, his patrons, ii. 155, 156
—, his translation of the Bible, ii. 157
— and Lollards, ii. 157
—, Appendix IV., ii. 289 ff.
Wickliffites, ii. 119
Wilberforce, Archdeacon, ii. 263
Will, Divine, confusion in apprehending, 39, 40
William de St. Amour, ii. 86, 150; Appendix III., ii. 286 ff.
William III., King, ii. 175
Williams and Laud, ii. 214
Wives of Clergy, ii. 64
Wolsey, Cardinal, ii. 190, 244
'World,' meaning of, in N.T., ii. 101
Wren, Bishop of Ely, ii. 215

XENOPHON, 157
Xerophagies, 36

YEAR-BOOKS, contemporary, as evidence of unquietness of England under Roman Ecclesiastical rule in the Middle Ages, ii. 161

ZABARELLA, Cardinal of Florence, ii. 121
Zachary, Pope, ii. 50
Zeal of Constantine, whether genuine, 239
—, 'flaming,' ii. 167
— seldom united with moderation, as in Frith, ii. 196
—, intolerant, of Luther, ii. 207
Zeno, Melanchthon's New, ii. 229
Zwinglianism, ii. 218

THE END.

Spottiswoode & Co. Printers, New-street Square, London.

J. [illegible]

THE HECKMAN BINDERY INC.
BOUND TO PLEASE
JULY 75